MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

9 SEPTEMBER 1982

Arab Summit Conference

Arab leaders attending the Arab summit in Fes adopted a joint peace plan for settling the Palestinian problem based on Saudi, Tunisian and U.S. initiatives, KUNA reported. The text of the draft Arab peace plan, published by the UAE paper AL-KHALIJ and carried by WAKH, made reference to the Saudi and Tunisian peace initiatives. Among its eight points, the plan calls for Israel's withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Arab Jerusalem; the dismantlement of Israeli settlements built since 1967; a short transition period in the West Bank and Gaza followed by the establishment of a Palestinian state led by the PLO and with its capital in Jerusalem; and peace guarantees for countries in the region -- including Palestine -- to be laid down by the UN Security Council.

Sources cited by Nouakchott radio indicated that the Arab leaders intend to send a three-man delegation to the United States to discuss the Middle East issue.

SPA reported that a "reconciliation" meeting was held on 8 September attended by the kings of Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Jordan, the Kuwaiti amir and the presidents of Iraq and Syria. Earlier, Saudi King Fahd met with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad in a closed session, Riyadh radio confirmed. However, a SANA correspondent cited by Damascus radio asserted that the meetings that took place between some heads of state were only for "protocol reasons." Meanwhile, Monte Carlo radio said Al-Asad was not present at the latest closed summit session.

The PDRY president left the conference unexpectedly after press reports of a coup attempt in his country, KUNA reported.

Israel

Prime Minister Menahem Begin, in his second speech of the day to the Knesset, launched a point-by-point attack on U.S. President Ronald Reagan's Middle East peace plan and threatened the opposition parties with new elections in May or June 1983. Claiming that Reagan's plan has distorted the content of the Camp David accords, Begin said "nobody will determine for us the borders of Eretz Yisra'el," and the Israeli Cabinet will maintain its rejection of the Reagan proposals "with total dedication." In his remarks, which were broadcast live by Jerusalem radio, Begin claimed that while Reagan had adopted his plan for political reasons, the issue for Israel concerns lives and homeland. Judaea and Samaria are for the Jewish people, he stressed. Excoriating the opposition Alignment for its "glee" over the Reagan plan, Begin said early elections will prove the real strength of the opposition. The friendship between Israel and the United States will continue to exist long after Reagan's plan -- which was "stillborn" -- is nothing but a memory, the prime minister asserted.

Begin began his speech by revealing that the Israeli Air Force had just destroyed another Syrian SAM battery in Lebanon. He renewed his warning to the Syrians that Israel will not permit them to deploy SAM's in Lebanon and that any such battery introduced there will be destroyed.

Lebanon

Military Situation -- Israeli planes attacked and destroyed a SAM-9-launching vehicle in the Dahr al-Baydar area north of Bhamdun, the IDF spokesman announced in a statement reported by IDF radio. A Syrian military spokesman confirmed that four Israeli aircraft bombed Syrian antiaircraft defenses in the area, hitting an air defense vehicle, according to Damascus radio.

U.S. Marines will leave Beirut 10 September, Beirut radio reported, citing an official announcement.

PLO Warning to Israel -- In a statement carried by Aden Voice of Palestine radio, a PLO military spokesman confirmed that the PLO holds eight IDF POW's and warned that Israel must stop its "savage treatment" of detainees held in camps or the PLO will be forced to change its methods of dealing with prisoners -- methods which currently are in accord with the Geneva Convention.

Egypt

The international community should devote all its capabilities in the coming months to achieving a just and comprehensive Middle East settlement through negotiations involving all concerned sides, including representatives of the Palestinian people, President Husni Mubarak declared at a banquet speech in Bucharest broadcast by Cairo radio. Earlier, Mubarak said in a Belgrade press conference broadcast by Cairo radio that although the U.S. peace plan is not 100-percent positive, the Americans should be encouraged to continue with their initiative because it will be possible to find a solution to the "negative aspects" through negotiations. It would be wrong to reject Reagan's initiative outright, he added.

Saudi Arabia

An Interior Ministry official cited by Riyadh radio announced that despite Iranian assurances that pilgrims would not engage in political activities, a group of Iranian pilgrims gathered outside a Medina mosque and chanted political slogans, causing the police to disperse them. Tehran radio claimed that thousands of Iranian pilgrims, led by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeyni's pilgrimage representative, along with pilgrims from other countries, marched through the streets of Medina to protest Tehran bombings and the Fes summit. However, a Saudi Interior Ministry source cited by SPA declared that the Tehran version of this event is untrue: No pilgrims from other countries attended the gathering and there was no mention of bombings or the Fes summit.

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 175 *9 September 1982*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW 1

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

Arab Summit Conference Continues in Fes A 1
'Arafat Position [London ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 7 Sep] A 1
Syrian Position [Damascus] A 1
ADF Withdrawal Approved [KUNA] A 2
PDRY Leader Departs [KUNA] A 3
'Important Meeting' [SPA] A 3
Damascus Television Report A 3
Fahd, Al-Asad Meet [Riyadh] A 4
'Reconciliation Meeting' [SPA] A 4
Monte Carlo Report A 4
Further Monte Carlo Report A 5
Numayri Proposal Withdrawn [Damascus] A 5
Al-Asad Absent From Session [Monte Carlo] A 6
Draft Peace Plan [AL-KHALIJ 9 Sep] A 6
Discussions End [INA] A 7
'Arafat Makes Statement on Lebanon War [London AL-MAJALLAH 9 Sep] A 7
DFLP Accuses Israel of Executing Two Members [VOL] A 8
Salah Khalaf on Captured IDF Soldiers [Monte Carlo] A 8
Salah Khalaf on Criticism of Lebanon Visit [Monte Carlo] A 8
Khalid al-Hasan Grants Interview to AL-MADINAH [31 Aug] A 8
Habash Grants Interview to Vienna Television A 10

ARABIAN PENINSULA

SAUDI ARABIA

Interior Ministry Official on Medina Gathering C 1
Iranian Report Denied C 1
Prince Sultan on Reagan Plan, Israeli Rejection C 1
World Muslim League Council Meets in Mecca C 2

PDRY

Aden VOP Carries Statement on Israeli POW's C 2

EGYPT

President Mubarak Arrives in Bucharest 8 Sep D 1
Holds Talks With Ceausescu D 1
Romanian Coverage of Visit [cross-reference] D 1
'Ali Interviewed on Palestinians, Camp David [Kuwait AR-RA'Y AL-'AMM 5 Sep] D 1
Ghali Meets EEC Envoys, Discusses U.S. Plan D 6
Papers Discuss Fes Summit, Reagan Initiative D 6

JORDAN

JORDAN TIMES Assesses U.S. Peace Plan Objectives [9-10 Sep] F 1
Daily Hopeful of Arab Peace Plan at Fes Summit [AR-RA'Y 8 Sep] F 3

LEBANON

Army Completes Deployment in Beirut Suburb G 1
Israelis Occupy Houses G 1
Possible Withdrawal of Syrian Forces Reported G 1
Monte Carlo Says PLO Reportedly Moving Back G 1
Sarkis, Dillon Discuss Multinational Force G 2
U.S. Marines To Leave 10 Sep G 2
Al-Wazzan Views Security Measures in East Beirut G 2
Al-Jumayyil Discusses Media, Foreign Papers G 3
Qulaylat Views Disarmament, Political Solution G 4
[AL-ITTIHAD 5 Sep]
Sham'un, Pierre al-Jumayyil View Current Situation G 4
Major Haddad Interviewed on Al-Jumayyil, Israel G 5
PLO, Civilian Casualty Figures Reported [AFP] G 7
West Beirut Casualties' G 7

ISRAEL

Knesset Debates Lebanon War, Reagan Plan I 1
Sharon Address I 1
Bar-Lev Address I 8
Begin Morning Address I 13
Shamir Address I 16
Hilel Address I 19
Begin Announcement on Missiles I 26
Further Begin Remarks I 26
Begin Summing-Up Address I 26
Likud Motion Adopted I 34
IDF Destroys 4 Syrian Launcher Vehicles 9 Sep I 36
Leading Laborite Zadok Analyzes Reagan Plan I 37
[THE JERUSALEM POST 8 Sep]
Savidor Discusses 8 Sep Meeting With Bush I 41
POST Poll Shows Popularity Rise for Begin [7 Sep] I 42

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

President Receives Message From 'Arafat Q 1
Polish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 7 Sep Q 1

LIBYA

Al-Qadhdhafi, Husak Begin Talks in Prague Q 1
Anti-Fahd Demonstration in Medina Reported Q 1
AZ-ZAHF AL-AKHDAR Urges Arabs To Confront Enemy [6 Sep] Q 2
JANA: Al-Fatih Revolution Meets Arab Objectives Q 2

MAURITANIA

CMSU Meets, Supports PLO, Cites Concern on Chad Q 3

MOROCCO

LE MATIN Welcomes Reagan Mideast Proposals [3 Sep] Q 4

EAST AFRICA

ETHIOPIA

Voice of Somali, Abo Fronts Reports on Fighting R 1
'Abyssinian' Losses R 1
WSLF Attack R 1
District Chairman's Surrender R 1
Briefs: Soviet Delegation Ends Visit R 1

KENYA

Moi, Kaunda Discuss Need for OAU Summit R 1
Agreement on Cooperation R 2

SOMALIA

Sources Report Halt to Ethiopian Air Raids [QNA] R 2

UGANDA

Planning, Labor Ministers Address UPC Seminar R 3
Commentary Views 'Return to Rule of Law' R 3

WEST AFRICA

GHANA

Rawlings Inaugurates Army Defense Committee T 1
PNDC Lifts Ban on Issuance of Passports T 1
Delegation Leaves To Attend Tripoli Conference T 2

LIBERIA

Doe Details U.S., French, Moroccan Visits T 2
President Urges OAU Extraordinary Session T 5

SOUTHERN AFRICA

MOZAMBIQUE

Army Overruns Rebel Base in Manica Province U 1

NAMIBIA

Mudge: Administrator-General No Longer Neutral U 1

SOUTH AFRICA

Spokesman Denies Report on Zaire to Angola Drive U 1
Defense Force 'Regrets' Zimbabwean Statement U 1

ZAMBIA

Kaunda Reportedly Suspends Power Minister U 2

ZIMBABWE

Official Cites Army Reduction, Defections U 2

ARAB SUMMIT CONFERENCE CONTINUES IN FES

'Arafat Position

PM081215 London ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 7 Sep 82 p 1

[Talhah Jibril report: "A Summit of Tolerance and Understanding"]

[Excerpts] Fes -- An atmosphere of tolerance and understanding prevailed in Arab summit conference circles yesterday. The Saudi monarch, King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, expressed satisfaction with the evident determination he discerned during his meetings with a number of Arab leaders to arrive at a unified Arab position. The leaders held a closed working session to prepare the agenda.

It has been learned that a Moroccan paper is expected to be submitted to the summit conference in an attempt to reconcile the various peace proposals presently under consideration.

Palestinian sources have told ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT that 'Arafat is not expected to accept President Reagan's proposals in full as presented, but the Palestinian leader "was behind the fact that there was no announcement of outright rejection."

The sources added that the meeting of the various Resistance factions held under 'Arafat's chairmanship in Tunis the day before yesterday heated and that 'Arafat listened to all views.

Commenting on the U.S. proposals before leaving Tunisyesterday, 'Arafat said: "We will give our opinion at the summit conference, with complete honesty and sincerity and in the name of the blood that was shed and the battles we fought in defense of Palestine, Lebanon and the entire Arab nation."

It has been learned that the leaders gave top priority to the question of clearing the Arab atmosphere and ironing out differences.

Syrian Position

JN081313 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Fes -- The Syrian radio and television team has reported that President Hafiz al-Asad's efforts at the 12th Arab summit conference were concentrated on maintaining a minimum level of joint Arab action in order to confront the Zionist-imperialist plot. Syria has also clearly announced its adherence to previous Arab summit resolutions on the Palestinian Arab people's inalienable rights. It announced that there is no reason for the Arabs to make concessions to the enemies because the situation requires steadfastness and rejection and confrontation of the enemies' schemes. Following is the voice dispatch from our team:

[Begin recording] The work of the 12th Arab summit conference in Fes has entered its 3d day. President Hafiz al-Asad continued his extensive activities yesterday, Tuesday, within the framework of the Fes summit. He held contacts and meetings with the heads of delegations and took part in the work of the subcommittee that stemmed from the conference on the level of presidents and kings. The president also took part in the conference's closed session last night. The president's efforts were concentrated on maintaining a minimum level of cooperation and joint Arab action in order to confront the Zionist and imperialist plots against the Arabs' rights to their territory and self-determination and against the central pan-Arab cause of Palestine.

Conference circles say that Syria has explained during all contacts and meetings held during the summit that it adheres to previous Arab resolutions on the Palestinian Arab people's inalienable rights. It also believes in the need to mobilize all Arab capabilities and energies for the Arab nation's main battle against the Zionist enemy and its supporters. These circles add that Syria does not see any reason for the Arabs to make concessions to the enemies and that the situation requires further steadfastness and firmness in confronting and rejecting the hostile schemes and in clinging to the pan-Arab rights and Arab lands. [end recording]

ADF Withdrawal Approved

LD081336 Kuwait KUNA in English 1241 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Fes, Morocco, Sept 8 (KUNA) -- The Arab kings and presidents have adopted a unified Arab peace plan for the settlement of the Palestinian crisis which was the main topic of discussion during their resumed summit. The unified Arab peace plan was drawn up in the light of the Saudi, Tunisian and American initiatives prepared by the political committee set up by the summit Monday evening.

The summit, which adjourned in the early hours of Wednesday, also voted to terminate the mandate of the 30,000-strong Syrian Arab Deterent Force [ADF] in Lebanon. The decision to ask the Syrian-manned Arab Deterrent Force to quit Lebanon was taken on the request of Lebanon which asked that all foreign forces in the country are to pull out, summit sources said. A committee set up by the summit comprising Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, PLO and Jordan passed a recommendation to the summit to withdraw the mandate of the ADF.

Commenting on the Fes report at about mid-day Wednesday, Radio Beirut said President Hafiz al-Asad had agreed to terminate the mandate of the Syrian-manned Arab Deterent Force in Lebanon.

The controversial eight-point Saudi plan calls for establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza and the right of all states in the region, a disguised reference to Israel, to live in peace led to break up of the first Fes summit last November.

The Tunisian plan, presented by President Habib Bourguiba, favours acceptance of the Security Council resolution of 1947 partitioning Palestine between the newly created State of Israel and Palestine.

But the Reagan plan firmly rejects the right of the Palestinians to an independent state suggesting instead the creation of some association between the West Bank and Gaza and present Jordan.

Summit sources declined to reveal contents of the unified Arab peace plan at the present time.

Summit sources said the conferees agreed to hold the 13th Arab summit in Saudi Arabia but did not give an initial date.

The summit will hold the third regular session this evening to discuss other issues on the agenda including the situation in Lebanon and the Iraqi-Iranian war. The 15 Arab kings and presidents and 5 representatives of the absent Arab leaders will decide during this evening's session whether to hold another round of meetings Thursday before adjourning for the duration.

PDRY Leader Departs

LD081[illegible] Kuwait KUNA in English 1627 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Fes, Sept 8 (KUNA) -- South Yemeni President 'Ali Nasir Muhammad Wednesday left here unexpectedly back home following press reports of an attempted coup d'etat in his country. No official explanation was given to his sudden departure which comes before the closing session of the Arab summit conference.

The London-based Saudi newspaper ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT said yesterday that the attempt was intended to topple the Yemeni leader in favour of the former South Yemeni President 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il.

'Important Meeting'

LD081832 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1810 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Ifrane, 8 Sep (SPA) -- An important meeting was held at 2000 Riyadh time that included His Majesty King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, King Hassan of Morocco, King Husayn of Jordan, Kuwaiti Amir Jabir al-Ahmad as-Sabah, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn and Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad. The meeting ended at 2100. During the meeting, talks were held to clear the atmosphere in Syrian-Iraqi and Syrian-Jordanian relations.

Damascus Television Report

JN081920 Damascus Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The work of the Arab summit sessions in Fes is proceeding in a calm and constructive manner. The discussions during the closed sessions of the conference's general assembly and the various committees were conducted in an objective manner and in an atmosphere pervaded by a general sense of responsibility and awareness of the present delicate circumstances and the imminent dangers. The discussions were characterized by frankness and seriousness.

The discussions in which the Syrian delegation took part showed Syria's firm, principled viewpoints concerning the basic issues submitted for discussion. The positive atmosphere and the general sense of responsibility demonstrated during the contacts and discussions have led to a resolution on the Palestine question and the Arab-Israeli conflict incorporating binding basic principles.

SANA can confirm that basic principles of great importance were unanimously agreed upon during the conference. These principles will be announced in the documents issued by the conference. Foremost among these principles is the assertion of the Palestinian Arab people's right to determine their own destiny and to exercise their inalienable national rights under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, including the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital.

The conference's documents will hail the steadfastness of the Syrian Armed Forces, the Palestinian Revolution forces and the Lebanese and Palestinian people.

SANA has learned that Syrian and Iraqi views on the Iraq-Iran war remain basically different.

The periods between the conference's official sessions witnessed intensive political activities by President Hafiz al-Asad and the other members of the Syrian delegation with the other delegations attending the conference. The meetings were pervaded by a high sense of national responsibility and a spirit of understanding and cordiality. It is hoped that this spirit will continue after the summit.

The main discussion during these meetings was on means to bolster the Arab stand facing the Israeli occupation forces and their allies, to pool Arab resources and to direct political activity in the service of the central objective. The discussions which took place during the conference and the bilateral meetings between Arab kings, presidents and amirs stressed the basic principles issues that were approved in previous Arab summits, especially the right of the Palestinian Arab people to determine their own destiny and the necessity for the Israeli forces to withdraw from all the territories they occupied during the 1967 aggression.

Fahd, Al-Asad Meet

LD081934 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] His Majesty King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz and his excellency the Syrian president, Hafiz al-Asad, held a closed meeting at his majesty's residence. The meeting began at 1530, kingdom time, and was held within the framework of private meetings for consultations on the issues being discussed by the Arab leaders in order to achieve positive results.

'Reconciliation Meeting'

LD082054 Riyadh SPA in English 1924 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Ifrane, Morocco, Sept 8 (SPA) -- A top-level reconciliation meeting was held here tonight to "clear the atmosphere" in Syrian-Iraqi and Syrian-Jordanian relations.

The meeting was attended by Saudi King Fahd, Moroccan King Hassan, Jordan's King Husayn, Kuwait's Emir Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad as-Sabah, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn and Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad. The meeting was preceded by private discussions held by King Fahd with various leaders in an attempt to re-establish Arab solidarity.

The kings and heads of state travelled here from Fes earlier today to watch an Arab folklore festival. They later departed again for Fes for a closed-door meeting tonight to discuss findings by the political and ministerial committees, formed by the summit, on the Middle East problem as a whole and the situation in Lebanon.

Summit sources earlier said the participants today endorsed a unified Arab peace plan to resolve the Palestine problem based on Saudi, Tunisian and American proposals. Arab leaders were also reported to have agreed to terminate the mandate of the all-Syrian Arab Deterrent Force (ADF) in Lebanon and to hold the next summit -- the 13th -- in Saudi Arabia.

Monte Carlo Report

JN082140 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 2040 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Telephone dispatch by Radio Monte Carlo news director Antoine Nawfal from Fes -- live]

[Text] I arrived from Ifrane a few moments ago. The third day of the Fes summit conference was characterized by the banquet King Hassan II hosted in honor of those attending. During this banquet in Ifrane, performances of horsemanship and folk dancing took place and political talks were held. These talks are still under way and may delay the conclusion of the summit until late tonight or tomorrow.

In any case, three major topics dominated the agenda: Lebanon, the Syrian-Iraqi dispute and the King Fahd plan. In short, one may say that the summit adopted King Fahd's plan with some amendments to the seventh clause. The clause on safeguarding the security of the countries in the region was replaced by a clause on implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions in this respect. The countries listed include the Palestinian state, the fate of which is not linked to Jordan.

No reference has been made to the U.S. plan either directly or indirectly, but it was present in everyone's mind.

With regard to the Iraqi-Syrian differences and in view of their deep-seated nature, the Arab kings and presidents have worked to freeze them at least, without letting them deteriorate any further. Optimists speak of a reopening of borders, perhaps of reopening borders between the two countries.

As for Lebanon, after the special ministerial committee adopted the Lebanese working paper, and after this paper was distributed, the Syrian delegation asked for the introduction of some amendments that deal with penalties against those who carry arms in Lebanon and many other things. This obstacle, which was dealt with a few moments ago by King Hassan II, King Fahd, President al-Asad, Joseph Abu Khatir and 'Arafat, may be overcome following the meeting that is underway between Moroccan Foreign Minister Boucetta and Joseph Abu Khatir, the head of the Lebanese delegation.

This is all we can say so far about the Fes summit, which will most probably hold a final session in the next few moments.

Further Monte Carlo Report

JN090606 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0500 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] The Arab kings, presidents and heads of delegations did not sleep last night, because the Arab summit continued its work in Fes until the early hours of this morning. We have learned that some differences in opinion have emerged at the last moment. However, the Arab leaders are working hard to overcome these differences in their closed secret meetings.

The summit is discussing three major topics: Lebanon, the Palestinian issue and inter-Arab differences. As for Lebanon, it seems the Syrian delegation, after having approved the Lebanese working paper, requested some amendments to it. As for the Palestinian question, the summit is expected to issue an Arab plan as a solution. Most of the principles of this plan are inspired by the Saudi peace proposals with concentration on a Palestinian state that is not linked with Jordan. The plan also refers to the UN Security Council's role in any solution. As for the inter-Arab differences, the information available from Fes says there is no room for any rapprochement in the Syrian-Iraqi and Syrian-Jordanian viewpoints.

Numayri Proposal Withdrawn

JN090620 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] The SANA correspondent to the Fes Arab summit conference has learned that no reconciliations were made among the various Arab countries at the summit. Some Arab heads of state suggested discussing Arab differences at the conference, but no decisions were adopted in this regard. The meetings between some delegation heads on various social occasions peripheral to the conference were due to mere protocol reasons. The SANA correspondent has also learned that during yesterday's session Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri raised the subject of Egypt's return to Arab ranks. However, the conference unanimously rejected this proposal. This forced the Sudanese president to withdraw his proposal.

Al-Asad Absent From Session

JN090638 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0600 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Excerpt] The Arab summit conference continued its work during the night in a closed session that was not attended by Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad. Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam represented the Syrian president at this session.

Draft Peace Plan

GF090744 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0650 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] Ash-Shariqah, 9 Sep (WAKH) -- AL-KHALIJ published the text of the first draft of the Arab peace plan today. The plan includes eight points, and was prepared by a Fes summit subcommittee in order to achieve peace in the Middle East. Following is the text of the draft resolution as published in AL-KHALIJ daily:

The Arab summit conference greets the steadfastness of the Palestinian Revolution forces, the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, the Arab Syrian Armed Forces and all those who participated in this steadfastness of Arabs and Muslims. The summit expresses support for the Palestinian people's struggle in order to recover their national rights.

Out of faith in the capabilities of the Arab nation to be true to its desired goals and to eliminate the Israeli occupation; stemming from the principles and the bases that were defined by the resolutions of the Arab summit; out of a strong desire by Arab countries to work using all means in order to forge a peace based on justice in the Middle East; considering the plan of President Habib Bourguiba which is based on international resolutions as bases for resolving the Palestinian issue; considering the plan of His Majesty King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz and in light of the discussions held and remarks made by the kings, presidents and amirs, the conference adopts the following points:

1. Withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories which were occupied in 1967, including Arab Jerusalem.

2. Dismantlement of the settlements that Israel built in the occupied Arab territories after 1967.

3. Assurance of freedom of worship and freedom of performance of rituals for all religions in the holy places.

4. The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination is stressed, along with the right of having their national rights overseen by the leadership of the PLO, their sole representative. In addition, compensation is to be provided to those who do not want to return home.

5. The West Bank and Gaza Strip will be subject to a transition period under the supervision of the United Nations for a period not exceeding a few months.

6. Establishment of a Palestinian state with its capital in Jerusalem.

7. Peace guarantees among all area countries, including the Palestinian state, will be laid down by the UN Security Council.

8. The UN Security Council will guarantee the implementation of these principles.

Discussions End

JN091017 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0945 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] Fes, 9 Sep (INA) -- According to the INA team, the Arab kings and presidents have concluded their discussions of all the agenda topics at the closed session that ended at dawn today. Citing sources close to the conference, the team added that during their closed meeting the Arab leaders stressed the need to bolster Arab solidarity and put an end to the Arab differences which have exhausted Arab capabilities. These sources considered the conference successful because there was an Arab consensus on the principles of Arab solidarity and the fact that the PLO is the Palestinian people's sole legitimate representative.

The INA team cited these sources as saying that PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat yesterday called for a meeting of the Arab defense, foreign and economy ministers to draw up a collective Arab security strategy. These sources added that some of the summit resolutions will be kept secret and will only be made public in due time. They also said the conference will send delegations to Washington, Moscow and some European countries to discuss the situation in the Arab region with these countries' leaders and to obtain official recognition of the PLO.

'ARAFAT MAKES STATEMENT ON LEBANON WAR

NC091024 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0905 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] London, 9 Sep (MENA) -- PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat has stated that, during the war in Lebanon, he contacted President Husni Mubarak and other Arab leaders and consulted with them.

In a statement to the London-based Arabic magazine AL-MAJALLAH published on Saturday, 'Arafat said that following the Beirut battle the bell is ringing for the Arab nation, asking which Arab country would be the third to fall after Palestine and Lebanon. He added that if the Arab nation fails to take action to confront the imminent danger, we are in for a new Israeli era. If the Arabs are late in shouldering their responsibilities, I expect they will regret it when it is too late.

'Arafat pointed out that the Lebanese war was the longest Arab-Israeli war and that the United States was a full partner in this war. The United States supported Israel with military, financial and diplomatic aid through the use of the veto in the United Nations.

In his first statement following his departure from Beirut, 'Arafat accused U.S. envoy Philip Habib of having played the simultaneous roles of adversary, judge and mediator during the negotiations in the war. He said: I have paid all the bills in full. I have paid the Lebanese, Israeli, U.S., Arab and international bills.

In his statement, 'Arafat disclosed that the Israeli forces almost reached his main office in the Al-Fakhani area in Beirut. Sharon dreamed about holding a press conference there. He actually planned to take the Palestinian command members prisoner and place them [words indistinct] but the (?heroism) of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples prevented Israel from (?swallowing) Beirut since the attempts (?began) to break through the capital.

The Palestinian leader emphasized that he decided to go directly from Beirut to Athens as a result of what happened during the war, particularly because of certain Arab stands.

He said that on the day he left Beirut a fedayeen group carried out a heroic operation in which they killed four Israelis and injured seven others. 'Arafat pointed out that in the new stage it is better to keep the PLO's plans and movements secret. He stressed [words indistinct] the resolutions and recommendations the PLO will make such as relocating the PLO headquarters.

'Arafat said he expects positive developments in relations between the PLO and (?France) in the future. He said he felt a change in the U.S. position, in U.S. public opinion and in the circles of congressmen and senior U.S. officials.

Concluding his statement, 'Arafat said that the Palestinian Revolution will continue until victory. He said: We adhere to our rights and will not give up [words indistinct]. There must be reactions to this Israeli plot which is aimed against the entire Arab region.

DFLP ACCUSES ISRAEL OF EXECUTING TWO MEMBERS

NC061242 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1215 GMT 6 Sep 82

[Text] The Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine [DFLP] of Nayif Hawatimah has accused the Israeli forces of executing last Thursday two DFLP members who lived in the Palestinian camp of Abu al-Aswad in southern Lebanon.

SALAH KHALAF ON CAPTURED IDF SOLDIERS

JN081913 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1900 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Fatah command member Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf] has stated in Damascus that negotiations are being held with the International Committee of the Red Cross concerning the eight Israeli soldiers who were taken prisoner by the Palestinian Resistance in the Bhamdun area in Lebanon last Saturday evening.

SALAH KHALAF ON CRITICISM OF LEBANON VISIT

JN082026 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 2000 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] In Damascus, Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf], Fatah's second in command, has rejected the criticism leveled at him by some Lebanese figures concerning his recent visit to Al-biqa' and Tripoli. Abu Iyad denounced the stand of some Lebanese parties who insist on expelling the Palestinian and Syrian foreigners while not viewing as foreigners the 120,000 Israelis who are occupying Lebanon.

KHALID AL-HASAN GRANTS INTERVIEW TO AL-MADINAH

GF081838 Jidda AL-MADINAH in Arabic 31 Aug 82 p 8

[Interview with Khalid al-Hasan, PLO Executive Committee member, by AL-MADINAH correspondent 'Abd al-Bari 'Atwan in London -- date not given]

[Excerpts] [Question] How can the political victory you have achieved be employed to serve the Palestinian issue in the future?

[Answer] We should not become arrogant in the future as a result of this victory because arrogance is self defeating.

We have to realize that if the political and moral victory our struggle achieved during the battle of Beirut is not backed by an Arab stand, especially by Saudi Arabia, that can change this victory into a real political victory and that if this victory is not accompanied by Arab pressure led by Saudi Arabia so that the Palestinian people attain their right to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent state, everything will end up a merely a page of history and we will have to start from the beginning again. Therefore, the Palestinian command will make a comprehensive assessment of what happened in Lebanon and what was achieved during the Lebanon war. After that the Palestinian command will determine its political stands and present them to the Arab countries in order to achieve Arab solidarity. If we fail to achieve Arab solidarity, we will seek a Saudi-Gulf solidarity that can influence the Arab countries to side with the PLO.

[Question] What are the chances of future Palestinian military efforts? Some people say that the Resistance cannot continue military struggle, especially since the Palestinian troops left Beirut and are far away from the confrontation line.

[Answer] You should understand military struggle from the Palestinian point of view. We know we will not be able to destroy the Israeli army. The destruction of the Israeli army requires an Arab military force, foremost of which is the Palestinian force. Regrettably, this Arab force is not available now.

The Palestinian military force is doing patriotic work. This patriotic work is a Palestinian matter and can be carried out under any circumstances. The number of patriotic operations might be different, but the Resistance is capable of improving the quality of its operations if the United States continues its stand that is hostile to the Palestinian people, if Saudi Arabia and Gulf states do not exert enough pressure on the United States, and if Arab solidarity is not achieved, or if the Arabs refrain from adopting a practical and serious stand that can convince the West of its seriousness. The problem of the West with the Arabs is that the West does not take Arab stands and statements seriously, because they were never serious. However, if Arab solidarity or if at least the Saudi-Gulf stance is established on a serious basis, the situation will change. This requires clarity on the Palestinian stand as well. In this case, in my view the Palestinian command will be able to wage both a military and a political struggle at the same time. It seems that the Arab military option requires a different type of Arab leadership which has yet to come forth. This was clear from the Fes summit, because a leadership which cannot make a decision and which cannot handle leadership tasks loses its legtimacy. Anyway, leadership in the end means the ability to make decisions and the leader who cannot make decisions should not remain in a position of leadership.

[Question] Anyone who reviews past and present Zionist practices in order to delay a fair and peaceful settlement can predict that Israel intends to launch a strike on Jordan to create a substitute Palestinian state, about which Sharon spoke in Washington. Should we now expect a new military adventure in Jordan after Lebanon?

[Answer] Any action by Israel is possible as long as the United States unconditionally backs it. Here is where the Saudi, Gulf and Arab stance is important in changing the U.S. stand. If the Arab stand remains merely theoretical and the winning cards it possesses are not effectively used, nothing will change, and I am not referring to oil or assests.

I am talking about how we can employ our capabilities and about the projects that U.S. companies are executing in Third World and Arab countries and with Arab money. This weapon is very effective and can be exploited, and we can use the game of international balance to our advantage. There are many cards, among which are Arab solidarity and Arab seriousness. It is painful to hear U.S. presidents say the Arabs did not demand a Palestinian state from them. It is even more painful not to find a proper Arab respond to this.

[Question] Much criticism was directed toward the Soviet Union in the past few days to the extent that some Palestinian leaders who have good relations with the Soviets accused the Soviet Union of abandoning the Palestinian Resistance. How do you value the Soviet stand toward the events in Lebanon?

[Answer] The Soviet Union is a superpower whose strategy, like that of the United States, encompasses the entire globe. The Soviets deal with the Palestinian issue as part of an international strategy and from the framework of the Yalta and other agreements, and Vietnam was an example of such strategy. The major world powers avoid military confrontation, because a confrontation can lead to a world war.

During the battle of Beirut, the Soviets offered what was required of them. They cannot fight for us because we are not Poland. We should not ask the Soviet Union to fight on our behalf. We have the money, the men and the weapons. The problem does not lie in the Soviet stand but in the Arab will to fight.

HABASH GRANTS INTERVIEW TO VIENNA TELEVISION

AU041420 Vienna Domestic Television Service in German 1950 GMT 3 Sep 82

[Interview with PFLP leader George Habash by Werner Fietzthum in Beirut "a few days ago" -- recorded in English with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Fietzthum] Habash is regarded as the head of Palestinian terrorism. The worldwide reaction against terrorism encouraged the antiterrorism policy of 'Arafat's Al Fatah organization. The PLO began to publicly denounce terrorism as a means of struggle. Habash's popular front renounces further [terrorist] actions.

[Habash] Previously, 10 years ago or more, there were certain actions in Europe, but it has become clear since March 1972 that this was wrong. We are going to concentrate our fight only inside Palestine to liberate Palestine, or parts of Palestine, as a first step toward our goals. I can assure you that neither the PLO nor the PLPF are now planning any terrorist actions. We are thinking of continuing our political struggle, or our armed struggle, inside Palestine to build an independent state. Of course, Israeli Zionist propaganda always says this is terrorism, that is terrorism, and so forth. From our point of view, we are strugglers for freedom. We hate terrorism, and we want to fight only for the liberation of our country.

[Question] In your opinion what is the difference between terrorism and military operations in Israel?

[Answer] There is a great difference. To me, terrorism is an individual act against certain aims [as heard] in Europe, in Vienna, in America and so forth. To fight for the liberation of Palestine or a part of Palestine by armed struggle is to follow the method of so many nations that got their independence. There was no other way for getting real independence. This has happened in so many Latin American and African countries.

[Question] Can you see any political solution which also accounts for the rights of Israel? What would the PLO have to do to obtain its rights?

[Answer] Well, the first job in front of the PLO at the present moment is to keep its unity, to stick to its political program, which means continuing its fight for a fully independent Palestinian state.

Please do not ask me about the recognition of Israel. After wh we saw here -- after all this barbarism -- no one can ask us to recognize Israel. Let us fight for our national rights and get them. This is our first task at the moment. Even Spain does not presently recognize Israel. Why then, do you want me, a Palestinian, after seeing all that has happened here, to think of recognizing Israel?

[Question] Will the PLO become more radical after this war?

[Answer] I hope it will, and we will struggle for it.

[Question] What does this mean precisely?

[Answer] It means we should stick to our political program, that is, for a fully independent Palestinian state. You know, many Arab forces are now trying to make us, the PLO leadership, follow the Camp David line or to accept something less than a fully independent state. By taking a radical step, defending a radical concept, a radical program, I mean to endorse the program that was adopted at the latest Palestine National Congress.

[Question] Does this also include military actions inside Israel?

[Answer] We cannot give up armed struggle. If you can assure me 100 percent that I can have, that we Palestinians can obtain, an independent state by diplomatic means, all right. Why lose the life of any of our comrades? But I am sorry to say that we have tried all possible diplomatic and political steps for so many years with no radical results. We will continue to fight diplomatically and politically, but we have also to continue our armed struggle.

[Question] Do you see any problems between your organization and Al-Fatah concerning the question of what roads lead to a Palestinian state?

[Answer] We are always working for a general program between us and Fatah. There are always differences. In spite of all these differences we are doing our best always to achieve a general conclusion, that is, a general program. For example, during this war we were against any relations with Husni Mubarak's regime in Egypt This has not caused us to bring about a split within the PLO. We mentioned that we are against any relations with Husni Mubarak. At the same time we continued our joint efforts to be able to face up to the common danger which was represented by the Israeli invasion.

[Question] What, in your opinion, does this war imply for the future of the PLO?

[Answer] Well, this war actually had many, many meanings. For example, one of the most important meanings of what happened is that the Palestinian people, if they receive real assistance from revolutionary Arab states or a number of revolutionary states, can achieve their full aims in Palestine.

[Question] Finally, do you believe that after the evacuation of the PLO from Beirut everything in Lebanon is done with, or do you expect further fighting? In the Biqa' Valley, for example, or in the south of Lebanon?

[Answer] We are going to continue fighting against Israel from Lebanon, from Syrian borders, from Jordanian borders with all possible means. We will never give up fighting unless we are forced to do so. When forced, we will go on fighting underground if we cannot fight openly. We are fighting for a just cause. There is no way but to continue fighting for this right cause. If you had been here for the last 2 months, maybe you would understand to what extent we believe in our just aims and to what extent we will continue fighting until we reach our aims. We are a people. We have the full right to be a people and have the full right of a people. We are not ready to have the United States or Israel degrade us to a second or third class nation. We have the full right to have a full Palestinian state and we will continue fighting for this.

SAUDI ARABIA

INTERIOR MINISTRY OFFICIAL ON MEDINA GATHERING

LD081830 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] An Interior Ministry official has stated the following:

After afternoon prayers today, Wednesday, 8 September 1982, when worshipers left the Nabawi Mosque, a group of Iranian pilgrims, together with some disabled persons, gathered and chanted political slogans. They were carrying portraits of Khomeyni. Police intervened, prevented the march, took away the portraits and dispersed the demonstrators. It is worth mentioning the Khomeyni's envoy had assured officials that nothing of this sort would happen, but, regrettably, his promise was not fulfilled. May God guide us on the right path.

Iranian Report Denied

LD081704 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1510 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Jidda, 8 Sep (SPA) -- The Interior Ministry had denied a report by Tehran radio that pilgrims from other Islamic states joined a big march staged by thousands of Iranian pilgrims in Medina on the anniversary of the 8 September disaster.

A responsible source at the Interior Ministry pointed out in a statement today that Iranian pilgrims gathered at the Baqi' Cemetery, as is their custom, and that the general supervisor of Iranian pilgrims, Mr Musavi, attended this meeting in which no pilgrims from other Islamic states participated. The source reaffirmed that the Tehran radio report that the pilgrims denounced and condemned this crime and condemned the Fes summit conference is totally unfounded and untrue.

PRINCE SULTAN ON REAGAN PLAN, ISRAELI REJECTION

LD082056 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] His Royal Highness Prince Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, second deputy prime minister, minister of defense and aviation and inspector general, has expressed the hope that the Arab kings and presidents will come out with resolutions that serve our Arab and Islamic causes.

In a news statement at the end of his visit to King Fahd Air Force Base in At-Ta'if, his royal highness said in reply to a question about the U.S. President's Middle East peace proposals that the opinion representing the Arab nation toward these proposals will be the task of the Fes summit. His royal highness added that his personal opinion regarding these proposals is that this is the first time we have heard something from a U.S. president containing positive points. We must reassure ourselves of the fact that this plan is only the result of the Arab nation's position and its role in the economy and geography of the world. The more Arabs unite and stand in solidarity, he added, the more we shall hear.

Regarding Israel's rejection of these proposals, his royal highness said that this rejection is but a maneuver, adding that Begin's haughtiness is well known that that Israel's rejection was expected since Israel is accustomed to rejecting in order to be given. He pointed out that there are Israelis who call for deliberation regarding Israel's rejection of these proposals. His royal highness stressed the need for Arabs to demand their rights, adding that the rights belong to the Arabs while Israel is the usurper. He stressed that it is the Palestinians' right to struggle on any front, in the methods they choose. He hoped that there will be understanding between Iraq and Iran to resolve their dispute peacefully rather than by war.

WORLD MUSLIM LEAGUE COUNCIL MEETS IN MECCA

LD061246 Riyadh SPA in English 1905 GMT 4 Sep 82

[Text] Mecca, Sept 4 (SPA) -- The World Muslim League Constituent Council's president, Shaykh 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn al-Baz, today sent a cable of thanks to King Fahd, expressing the council members appreciation for the Saudi monarch's moral and material assistance to the league and the kingdom's support for Islamic causes led by the Palestine question.

Addressing the opening session of the council's 24th meeting here, Shaykh al-Baz called on members to exert more efforts in their countries to spread Islam and implement Sharia laws instead of civil laws adopted by their governments.

He said the council was paying great attention to Islamic issues, specially the Palestine and Jerusalem questions. Shaykh al-Baz said the current session would discuss Muslim affairs in light of latest developments in the Islamic and Arab world.

The Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) Secretary-General Habib Chatti's address was also read on his behalf at today's session. Mr Chatti praised the "Palestinian and Lebanese peoples steadfastness against the Israeli enemy in west Beirut." He also deplored the "escalating communist aggression" in Afghanistan despite repeated calls made by U.N. and its efforts to "convince the Soviet Union to refrain from military incursion in this Muslim state." Mr Chatti highlighted the role played by the Islamic reconciliation committee to resolve the Iran-Iraq conflict.

Mr Chatti expressed the ICO's and the Islamic nation's appreciation for King Fahd's and the kingdom's "successful efforts and fruitful work to translate Islamic solidarity into a reality." The league's secretary general, Shaykh Muhammad 'Ali al-Harkan, who also addressed the session, underlined the importance of "this gathering which comes as the Islamic world was facing a difficult time."

PDRY

ADEN VOP CARRIES STATEMENT ON ISRAELI POW'S

GF081550 Aden Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1815 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] The military spokesman of the Palestinian Revolution has issued the following statement:

One of our groups operating behind enemy lines -- the No 2 Palestinian fighter-group of martyr Col 'Abdallah Siyam, martyr of the heroic Khaldah battle -- overran a Zionist military position in the Mount Lebanon area at 1300 on 4 September. All enemy personnel manning that position were captured along with their equipment. The eight enemy Zionist soldiers commanded by Maj [as heard] Rubin Cohen were taken prisoner of war.

This daring operation was carried out without firing a single shot because the position's soldiers and commander surrendered in a manner that revealed the extent of the enemy's cowardice and fear in the face of the will of the Palestinian Arab fighters.

In addition, the Palestinian Revolution command has informed the International Red Cross of their presence with us and that they will be treated as prisoners of war in light of the Geneva Convention in spite of the barbarism and savagery the Zionist enemy has exercised in dealing with prisoners of the Palestinian Revolution by treating them in a humiliating, hateful and unhumanitarian fashion.

This has been illustrated by the enemy's treatment of captured Palestinian fighters and Lebanese and Palestinian men, women and children, among whom hundreds were transported to detention camps in nets attached to helicopters, a horrible and harsh practice not even used by the Nazis.

We treat them as prisoners of war, a treatment to which enemy prisoners who have been held by the Palestinian Revolution can attest, which international organizations, the international community and the International Committee of the Red Cross know of, and on which the enemy press and the world press has reported. We warn the enemy authorities to cease their savage treatment of detainees held in Israeli detention camps and prisons so that we will not be forced to change our style of dealing with the prisoners held by us.

Long live the Palestinian Revolution! Glory and immortality for our reverent martyrs! Revolution until victory!

PRESIDENT MUBARAK ARRIVES IN BUCHAREST 8 SEP

NC081624 Cairo MENA in English 1447 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Excerpts] Bucharest, Sept 8 (MENA) -- Egyptian President Husni Mubarak arrived here this afternoon from Belgrade on a 3-day state visit to Romania.

The Egyptian president was received at Otopin Airport by President Nicolae Ceausescu, senior officials and multitudes of the Romanian people and the Egyptian community, who raised flags of Egypt and Romania as well as banners welcoming the Egyptian leader. The first round of official talks will open at 1800 (Cairo local time) and at 2000 President Ceausescu is to give a dinner banquet in honour of the visiting Egyptian president over which toasts will be exchanged.

Holds Talks With Ceausescu

NC082207 Cairo MENA in English 2140 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Bucharest, Sep 8 (MENA) -- The first round of official talks between Egypt and Romania under President Husni Mubarak and Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu started today in Bucharest tonight. The talks were attended on the Egyptian side by Deputy Premier and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali and by First Foreign Under Secretary Usamah al-Baz.

In an exclusive interview with MENA after the meeting, Dr al-Baz said the first session was devoted to a discussion of the international issues with the Middle East issue at the top. President Ceausescu reviewed in brief the Romanian visualization towards the international issues, Dr al-Baz said. Then he said President Mubarak made a comprehensive review of the existing international issues, with an emphasis on the Middle East issue and the issue of the Palestine people in particular, as well as the pressing need for achieving progress [words indistinct] right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of its homeland. Following the first session, Presidents Mubarak and Ceausescu agreed to complete discussion of the international issues privately tomorrow while the Egyptian and Romanian delegations will be reviewing issues related to bilateral relations, Dr al-Baz added.

Romanian Coverage of Visit

For Romanian media coverage of President Mubarak's visit to Bucharest, see the Romania section of the 9 September and subsequent issues of the Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT.

'ALI INTERVIEWED ON PALESTINIANS, CAMP DAVID

GF060739 Kuwait AR-RA'Y AL-'AMM in Arabic 5 Sep 82 p 16

[Kamal Hasan 'Ali, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, interviewed by Muhammad Yunis, in Cairo -- date, time not given]

[Excerpts] [Question] Most observers have said there was Arab and international collusion to bring about the departure of the Palestinian Resistance from Beirut. High-level Egyptian sources have declared that some Arab parties are deeply involved in the plot. Why this collusion and who specifically are these parties?

[Answer] Of course, we cannot say which parties are involved in this collusion. What can be said in this regard is not new. The Arab stand in general during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon was complacent and weak. The Arab stand should have produced something other than the negativism with which it was branded by various political and cultural circles throughout the world. On the other hand, I say: What the Arab stand produced was the result of inter-Arab differences and conflicts, as well as the lack of clarity in a strategic view of Arab action in past stages -- and there were many stages, both military and political.

We hope not to look back at the past but to look toward the future. We hope that there will be a minimum degree of Arab agreement to solve the problem and a consensus on a view of the future that will ensure that return of the Palestinian people to their land and restore their rights to them. I believe that the available Arab capabilities enjoy sufficient international support to achieve this. The Arabs' relations with other countries will consolidate this concept and achieve this objective, if the Arabs are united and if they clearly define their objective and the way to achieve it.

[Question] Therefore, it is clear that the Palestinians have achieved in the 80-day war what they could not achieve in the past years. What in your view is the strategy required in the present stage to deal with the situation, particularly as Israel has lost the initiative -- politically at any rate?

[Answer] Let us first agree that resolving this issue in accordance with the resolutions of the Rabat 1974 Arab summit can be achieved primarily by peace. Hence, it is necessary to draw up a strategy for peace. Such a peace strategy must take into consideration all the factors in the international situation and the stands of the Arab countries. I am not in a position to draw up a strategy for the Arab world or the Palestinian question. It is merely a perception -- a perception of an Arab agreement on a clear, well-defined and practical policy. We have too often raised slogans which we have failed to carry out.

[Question] On the basis of this, what perceptions do you have to offer the Palestinians so they can achieve the desired goal?

[Answer] I do not have to formulate a perception for the Palestinians, for they themselves have waged all kinds of battles and have been placed in all sorts of situations. They have their own circumstances. However, the Palestinians must first be united. We sense that within the PLO, there are differences of views and differences over the way to a solution. In the past, Egypt proposed the idea of a provisional government or a Palestinian government-in-exile. The purpose of this was that the responsibility should be one, and views and policies should be united. In our view this should be the first step.

[Question] Although Palestinian differences occasionally surface, at critical times, the Palestinian stand is united. This is what happened during the Lebanese crisis. Is it possible to view differences among Palestinians as a problem that can be overcome in times of crisis?

[Answer] I disagree with you on this. The unity that existed among the Palestinians in Beirut during the Israeli invasion was a military unity, a unity of leadership during a crisis. Political unity is another matter. Some groups may pursue an extremist line, while others may take the view that political activity is the best way to put Israel in an indefensible position, or to face the United States with its responsibilities. All these are tactics which may be pursued and on which there may be differences among the Palestinian factions. Therefore, as I have said, a provisional government will unite this policy. A minister may hold different views within the Cabinet, but outside it he is committed to the Cabinet's policy.

[Question] The PLO has given the most it can give by hinting at recognition of Israel. However, Israel, in the person of Begin, has said it is not interested in such recognition. What more is required?

[Answer] Once again, if we are agree that the United States holds the cards for a solution, let us turn to the United States. Egypt has fought four wars with Israel for the Palestinian cause. This is clear. In some of these wars Egypt depended on the great powers but ultimately we found that we were facing the United States militarily.

When we faced the United States politically it was possible to get something -- we may differ in assessing it but we got something. I believe that the PLO moved a little toward the United States when 'Arafat gave a document to McCloskey -- although some other statements, also by PLO officials, have divested this document of its contents. I am aware of the PLO's circumstances which do not allow it to issue more than this document. However, let us act more positively in the direction I have mentioned, as long as we agree that the United States holds the cards to the solution.

[Question] The United States, however, is placing obstacles and conditions on the PLO, foremost among which is the recognition of Israel, the acceptance of Security Council Resolution [242] and so on and so forth.

[Answer] As I have said there must be a persistent and firm movement in the direction I have indicated. Of course, this needs time, and I hope it will not be too long.

[Question] Public opinion in general, and Egyptian public opinion in particular, has criticized Egypt's stand on the Palestinian-Israeli war in Lebanon. Except for political activity, Cairo did not take a decisive stand, such as suspending relations with Israel, for instance. Egypt's action was confined to freezing the autonomy talks, which were semifrozen to begin with.

[Answer] Let me first state some facts before I answer this question. First of all, Egypt is an ancient country that has its constitutional institutions and its policy. This is why Egypt has always had a stable policy that does not change with circumstances. This is why Egypt has a clear and sound perception of matters. With regard to the first point, if Arab public opinion has criticized Egypt, I believe it would be criticizing the Egyptian people. With regard to the Egyptian people, one can see from the debate in the press and in the People's Assembly that the Egyptian people uphold their international commitments and the peace treaty. What the Egyptian people did is reject normalization of relations with Israel at the time the Israeli invasion of Lebanon was taking place. It is a noble and positive stand that reflects this people's vision. The opposition press may have taken a different line, and this is their right. However, the opposition press does not represent the Egyptian people. The majority of the Egyptian people are represented by the National Democratic Party, the government party. What Egyptian diplomacy did is clear. I do not believe that there was any Arab action that surpassed Egyptian action in this regard. Through our contacts with the PLO we sensed that Egyptian action, on both the government and the popular levels, was appreciated. This is our view of this matter.

[Question] Some political circles have said that your recent meeting with U.S. President Reagan was characterized by a certain degree of sharpness -- so much so, these circles say, that President Reagan asked you personally not to intervene on the issue of the Israeli invasion. How true is this?

[Answer] Of course, to say that my recent meeting with President Reagan was heated is an exaggeration. Undoubtedly, Egypt explained its view very frankly, a view that differed from the U.S. view -- and this happens between friends. The United States also had views which differed from ours on some of the issues connected with the PLO's departure from Beirut. However, our insistence on a comprehensive settlement was undoubtedly appreciated by all countries as well as the PLO. President Reagan never asked Egypt not to interfere in the events. Egypt lived these events minute by minute. We are an Arab country and what happens around us concerns us, and no one from within the region or from outside it has the right to ask Egypt to forfeit its national and Arab commitment.

[Question] Does the Egyptian-French initiative still exist? Will it be referred to the Security Council, and if so, when?

[Answer] The initiative still exists. Last week I sent a message to the secretary general of the Security Council on this initiative. Consultations are continuing to fix a time for submitting it to the Security Council. More discussions will take place regarding the amendments some parties want to propose to Egypt and France, the two countries which adopted this initiative.

[Question] If you are invited to the Fes summit, will you attend?

[Answer] First, I would like to affirm that Egypt did not sever its relations [with the Arab countries]. Egypt did not seek an Arab estrangement. President Husni Mubarak called for convening an Arab summit following the PLO's departure from Beirut. If Egypt should be invited it will attend because of its concern for the Palestinian cause, and because it is anxious that there should be joint Arab action on the Palestinian cause.

[Question] What would Egypt say to the Arabs if it were to attend the Fes summit?

[Answer] All I can say is: Let us all shoulder our responsibilities toward the Palestinian question honestly and sincerely.

[Question] Yasir 'Arafat recently sent a message to President Husni Mubarak but did not receive a reply. Why?

[Answer] What message? President Mubarak has replied to all the messages he received from Yasir 'Arafat.

[Question] A few moments ago the Israeli ambassador was here. Can we know the broad lines of the topics discussed during the meeting?

[Answer] It is natural that the Palestinian question and the Israeli invasion of Lebanon should be the most important topics in any conversation with the Israeli ambassador, so we can fully explain Egypt's view on this matter.

[Question] Will the autonomy talks be resumed?

[Answer] On one hand, I do not think that the climate is now favorable for any talks. On the other hand, the Israeli occupation of Lebanon without any clear indication on when the Israeli forces will withdraw from Lebanon, and Israeli practices in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, are all impediments to resuming the talks.

[Question] We noticed, indeed we have ascertained, that Egypt still adheres to the Camp David accords, although Israel has often violated these accords -- as with the civilian authority Israel has imposed on the West Bank and the settlements it planted in the occupied territories. How do you reconcile this conflicting stand between the two countries?

[Answer] There is no doubt that it is a conflicting stand. Egypt's interpretation is different from Israel's interpretation and conflicts with the measures Israel is carrying out. We are working with the United States to rectify this before the talks are resumed.

[Question] What is the interpretation to which the United States adheres and the basis for its stand?

[Answer] The United States was a partner in the Camp David accords, and this is indisputable. It is opposed to the establishment of settlements. It is aware of our stand on Jerusalem. Its interpretation is full autonomy during the transition period. Self-determination has been interpreted by Israel to mean that there should be no Palestinian personality at all, and we completely differ with it on this interpretation because the signatories to the Camp David accords did not mean this at all. Hence, the differences between us and Israel during autonomy talks that lasted 3 years.

When we now say we adhere to the Camp David accord we mean we an adhere to Egypt's concept and interpretation of the accords, a concept that achieves the first step along the road toward a full and strong autonomy paving the way for a transition period to establish a Palestinian state. This is the Egyptian interpretation.

[Question] How far has the Tabah crisis gone?

[Answer] The Tabah crisis has reached the stage of preparing a paper for reconciliation, arbitration and the transition of measures directly from reconciliation to arbitration. Negotiations have not yet begun with the Israeli side because the situation in Lebanon has not enabled us to complete the talks in these difficult conditions.

[Question] What are the most important features of President Husni Mubarak's forthcoming tour?

[Answer] As has been announced, President Mubarak's aim is to strengthen the Nonaligned Movement during his visit to Yugoslavia. As for Romania, it is concerned about the Middle East problem. Therefore, the purpose of Mubarak's visit there is to continue the consultations and dialogue with President Ceausescu.

[Question] It has been reported that there are top-level contacts and consultations going on between Egypt and some Arab countries. However, these have not been announced. Why?

[Answer] These have in fact been announced. Contacts have taken place between Egypt and Morocco, and between Egypt and Iraq. There have been contacts with some Jordanian officials. I believe that the Arab countries need some time to let contacts take their natural course -- and this of course is their affair.

Egypt does not want leadership, but our situation and our fate impose on us certain commitments which we carry out honestly and sincerely. Hence, the Egyptian role in supporting the Arab homeland as a whole. Events have proved this. Egypt has shouldered and continues to shoulder the battle for peace. Egypt has carried out its responsibility with regard to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and this qualifies Egypt to carry out a responsible role -- and I do not say a leadership role.

[Question] How do you view the Gulf situation in light of the Iraqi-Iranian war? What are the threats facing the Gulf? What action is required on the Arab level to face the situation?

[Answer] Naturally, we want the Iraqi-Iranian war to end as soon as possible. We also hope that peace will be established in the Gulf region for the sake of the peoples of the region, all of whose countries are Muslim. There is no victor or vanquished in this war. Destruction befalls both people and resources. The imposition of ideologies by force, or the imposition of a military solution to achieve a political victory are reminiscent of the 18th and 19th centuries. Such policies are obsolete. Today all countries have common interests. Undoubtedly, there are many interests in the region that can be united. Therefore, we hope that the Iraqi-Iranian war will end as soon as possible and without affecting Iran's relations with area countries or Iraq's relations with Iran. We hope, for the sake of the peace and progress of the peoples of the area, that natural relations between the two countries will be restored. However, the threat of some countries in the area seeking to impose certain regimes or beliefs still exists. This calls for caution for it is likely to bring further instability to the region.

GHALI MEETS EEC ENVOYS, DISCUSSES U.S. PLAN

NC081531 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Egypt has asked the EEC to continue its efforts to implement a comprehensive settlement for the Palestinian issue so a just and comprehensive peace may be attained in the region. This request was made during the meetings Dr Butrus Ghali, minister of state for foreign afffairs, held today with the ambassadors of Ireland, the Netherlands, Greece and Belgium. His excellency explained Egypt's stance toward the U.S. initiative. He also dealt with the forthcoming EEC meeting and the importance of the EEC's support.

PAPERS DISCUSS FES SUMMIT, REAGAN INITIATIVE

NC072334 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2217 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] Cairo, 7 Sep (MENA) -- In their comments on the Arab summit conference now being held in Fes, Morocco, AL-AKHBAR and AL-AHRAM emphasize in Wednesday's editions that the conference comes at a time when the entire Arab nation stands at the brink of an abyss and that there is no room for an Arab failure this time.

In its comment, AL-AKHBAR demands that the Arab kings and presidents comprehend that there is no longer any room for more of the obscure resolutions they have grown accustomed to and which they have passed at their previous conferences. This is because the present phase the Arab causes are passing through -- spearheaded by the Palestinian issue -- does not tolerate the minimum amount of the famous Arab outbiddings. The paper notes that positive changes exist from the Arabs can benefit greatly. First among these changes is the new U.S. stance represented by the proposals forwarded by U.S. President Reagan, the magnificent Palestinian steadfastness against the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the realities that have been unveiled by this invasion. The paper says it is imperative that the Arab states learn the painful lessons that they have been taught recently and that a unified stance be taken to confront the deluge of dangers and challenges from which no one can be safe if he stands alone.

In concluding its comment, the paper expresses Egypt's hope -- which has stood with utmost strength and decisiveness alongside the Arab causes -- that the Arabs will successfully negotiate this dangerous turning point through which the Arab nation is passing.

However, AL-AHRAM emphasizes that the recent events require those Arabs attending the summit conference to emerge from their conference with something characteristic of their mettle. This something would take the form of a number of feasible and specific resolutions which the world can take heed of, without entangling themselves in far-fetched uncertainties by entertaining aspirations that are almost impossible to achieve. The paper elucidates that the most important of these feasible resolutions would be those establishing a responsible Palestinian government-in-exile; encouraging the positive aspects of the U.S. initiative, in addition to inviting Egypt to return to the Arab fold or welcoming Egypt's return to this fold; and emphasizing the PLO's political independence far from the pressures of polarization.

The paper warns the conference against trying to reconcile the cards placed on its table. The reason is that past experience has proved tht such an attempt would only culminate in nullifying most of these cards of their true concept and just contenting one's own self with general formulas that achieve no progress or that might even bring about a setback.

JORDAN TIMES ASSESSES U.S. PEACE PLAN OBJECTIVES

JN090800 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 9-10 Sep 82 p 3

[Text] (Editor's note: This is the first of several columns in which JORDAN TIMES editor Rami G. Khouri analyses the new Middle-East initiative of the United States.)

The Middle East peace initiative launched by United States President Ronald Reagan one week ago is being handled very carefully by most people in the Arab world, and rightly so. Few people are going to venture a firm opinion for or against the move until the views of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) have been clarified, and rightly so again. For it is the Palestinians who have to enter a negotiating process with the Israelis, in the final analysis, and it is the Palestinians who will have to make the historic compromises that are inherent in any peace agreement based on the principle of twin statehood for Israelis and Palestinians. The other Arab states directly involved in the matter -- Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt -- are in a different, clearer position vis-a-vis a final peace with Israel because their territorial disputes with Israel are much simpler, a matter of exchanging occupied Arab territory for mutual recognition, and the final agreement on an internationally recognised frontier between Israel and each of these four Arab states.

The focus of all on the Palestinian-Israeli dispute brings us back to vicious circle of Palestinian-American-Israeli political dynamics and constraints. It is obvious that direct Israeli-PLO talks are still quite a way down the road, just as it is obvious that any negotiation for Palestinian concerns will have go be handled either directly or indirectly by the PLO.

Therefore, it seems to me that one of the more immediate objectives that one should work for is a PLO-American dialogue -- both because American recognition of the PLO in in itself a measure of political credibility, and because such an American-PLO dialogue would be about the most awesome form of "pressure" that the Americans could put on Israel and still maintain their claim that they do not want to pressure Israel by withholding arms or money.

The obstacle to an American-PLO dialogue has been the Kissinger commitment to an American ban on dealing with the PLO until it recognises Israel's right to exist and accepts U.N. Security Council Resolution 242. It appears that the Reagan initiative may contain the seeds for meeting these conditions while maintaining one's honor fully intact, on both sides of the issue.

On the first count, the PLO has put itself on the record as accepting the principle of Israeli statehood in its several Palestine National Council resolutions calling for the establishment of a Palestinian state on any part of Palestine from which Israel withdraws. This is cryptic language, but in it there is the conditional recognition of Israel that the Americans seek. It will require some subtle linguistic footwork to come up with a statement that implies, in principle, Palestine recognition of Israeli statehood and that is acceptable to the United States while being in line with stated Palestinian positions. I think it can be done.

But it will not be done in a political vacuum. It will have to be part of a process by which the PLO advances its political programme yet another notch. The history of the Palestinian national movement since 1964 is the history of increasingly specific and "moderate" Palestinian objectives, commensurate with international recognition of Palestinian national political goals as articulated by the PLO, and most particularly by the Palestine National Council -- the highest decision-making authority of the Palestinian people as a whole.

The intriguing element that I see in Mr. Reagan's proposals is the phrase that reads: "Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees." He follows this up with the two words: "I agree".

This relates to the second part of the Kissingerian conditions for an American-PLO dialogue -- the need for Palestinian acceptance of Resolution 242. The PLO rejects 242 -- and rightly so -- because it only refers to the Palestinians in terms of refugees. In any case, 242 was tailored specifically to meet the political needs of the situation that existed after the June 1967 war. Its main concern was a return to the status quo ante, and it was not in any manner designed as a tool to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli dispute or the broader Arab-Israeli conflict. For the Americans to have chosen it as a litmus test of Palestinian recognition of Israel is therefore intellectually unfair -- but such is the legacy of Dr. Kissinger that handcuffs today's would-be peace-makers.

So why has Ronald Reagan stated that the Palestinian issue is "more than a question of refugees"? My guess is that he is offering a possible means of getting around the strict demands of the Kissingerian commitments. What Mr. Reagan has done, in fact, is to say that the precise element in 242 that the Palestinians object to is also unacceptable to him and, presumably, to his people and government. By saying that the Palestinian issue is more than refugee problem, he has superseded 242 and make its reference to the Palestinians as refugees a thing of the past -- a benchmark to be ignored, or dealt with in terms of words that have form but no more lasting content. Thus it now seems possible for the PLO to look at 242 as a historical document whose principles are of mixed validity. The principles in 242 that still apply -- and that were emphasised so refreshingly by Mr. Reagan -- are that it implies Israeli withdrawal from occupied territory in return for Arab recognition of Israel, and that it applies to all fronts, including the West Bank and Gaza.

The reference in 242 to Palestinians as refugees, however, now seems obsolete and meaningless. It has been buried by no less an authority than the President of the United States of America. As such, we have the American making a significant step forward and saying to the Arabs and the Palestinians, in effect, "we are prepared to meet you half way on this."

It is strange, nevertheless, that we have had to wait 15 years for the Americans to come around to this realisation. But the significance of the American move in terms of offering a possible opportunity to break the American-PLO dialogue is one of the priorities of the Palestinians and the Arabs -- and I think that it surely is -- then the next few months could see important advances in this respect.

It is obvious that when the Americans finally decided to come off the fence and give us their interpretation of some of the key issues in the Palestine-Israel conflict, they came down rather clearly on the Arab side in many, but not all, matters.

The beauty of the Reagan initiative now, as opposed to the original Camp David framework accord for Palestinian autonomy as a transition phase until the ultimate status of the West Bank and Gaza was resolved, is that it seems to come down on the side of the Arabs in several key matters, while not ruling out Arab demands on the remaining matters. Those who would take the time to study the Reagan initiative will find that it is, in essence, a series of clarifications for the vague, unspecified issues that we objected to in the Camp David accords.

The Reagan plan is not offering a final outcome for the Palestinian issue. It is not designed to; and anyway, it could not do so because it is up to the parties involved -- the Israelis and Palestinians -- to determine that, and not up to the Americans.

There are many key issues that are not addressed in the Reagan plan. He does not refer to the PLO, for example, but that in itself is no surprise because he does not recognize the PLO -- and is unlikely to do so in a television speech. He does not refer to the original Palestinian refugees of 1948. He does not refer to the Palestinians outside of the West and Gaza.

He does not refer to United Nations General Assembly resolutions conferring statehood on the Palestinians in part of Palestine. He does not talk of Palestinian self-determination, but only of "self-government" and "domestic authority". Given the reality of diplomatic processes, he is probably right not to have given his views on these matters, because there are mechanisms that seem less ridiculous in view of the new Reagan clarifications stating that the occupied territories, in effect, have to return to full Arab sovereignty, that Jerusalem must remain undivided (and not "unified," which is the Israeli code word for Israeli control) and that the Palestinian issue is more than a question of refugees.

It seems to me that what has happened in the past week is that the Americans have quietly swallowed their pride, admitted the weakness of the Camp David accords in their original format and tried to come up with new, more precise clarifications that coincide in large part with stated Arab and Palestinian views. Mr. Reagan and his team seem to be involved in an exercise of opening doors -- an exercise for which we have been calling for years, if not decades.

The punctilio of diplomatic processes demands that the new American attitude should be studied closely and examined in great precision to identify any really new breakthroughs that could lead to a coincidence of American and Arab views. It seems, upon initial examination of the Reagan initiative, that there are some possibilities in this respect that could be exploited to great advantage by those whose peace-seeking impulses are genuine.

DAILY HOPEFUL OF ARAB PEACE PLAN AT FES SUMMIT

JN080818 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 8 Sep 82

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "Fes Summit and the Arab Peace Plan," today's AR-RA'Y writes: The Fes summit has quickly moved on to detailed discussion of the topics submitted to it, headed by the preparation of a unified Arab peace plan in light of studies of the Saudi, Tunisian and American peace plans. If the summit succeeds in drawing up and approving an Arab peace plan, it will be the first unified plan submitted by the Arabs on the Palestinian cause -- a cause about which there have been several international resolutions and non-Arab plans.

Agreeing to such a plan will open new horizons for the Arabs to activate the issue, undertake organized work in the international arena and take part in any solution to their cause. Naturally, this does not mean the Arabs should shut their doors and close their eyes to the positive points of the American and other peace plans. It means the formulation of an integrated Arab plan in light of which the Arabs could hold a dialogue with others and exchange opinions on the issue.

AR-RA'Y adds: The Arab role is no longer confined to answering others' plans with yes or no. It is time for the Arabs to exceed this with an Arab peace plan to be discussed with others. This is a natural and positive step that should not be misinterpreted.

No one doubts the painstaking efforts, accuracy, farsightedness and courage required to prepare such a plan. Since these factors constitute the elements of the historical responsibility being shouldered by the Arab leaders, it is natural for the Fes summit to undertake this task. The Arabs and non-Arabs as well as friends and enemies are looking forward to the outcome of this task.

There is a strong hope that the summit will succeed in accomplishing this task and the other tasks facing it with a unified Arab will. Only then will the unified Arab action turn into reality coupled with practice.

ARMY COMPLETES DEPLOYMENT IN BEIRUT SUBURBS

NC080949 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0900 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The Lebanese Army this morning completed its deployment into new quarters and streets in the southern suburbs of Beirut, including Al-Murayjah, Al-Ghubayrah, inner streets in Burj al-Barajinah from the direction of 'Ayn as-Sikkah, Mazra'at as-Sayyad, Harat Hurayk, Al-Mashnuq circles and the Coqodi. This was preceded by an Israeli withdrawal from the Al-Awza'i and the Picnic and the roads leading to the Henry Shihab barracks which the Lebanese Army took over 2 days ago. The army received a warm welcome from the citizens. A limited presence of armed men has been observed in various areas in the southern suburb.

Israelis Occupy Houses

NC081514 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] It has been observed that the army deployment in the [southern] suburbs [of Beirut] today was accompanied by an Israeli provocation. An Israeli detachment moved to the houses of the [Lebanese] officers opposite the traffic circle in front of the Kuwaiti Embassy and took up positions there. The Israeli detachment refused to leave the place despite the contacts that had taken place to secure its withdrawal. The members of the force protested by saying that they were acting on orders from their command.

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF SYRIAN FORCES REPORTED

NC081108 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1000 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] A report received by the Foreign Ministry indicates that the Arab ministerial committee set up by the summit conference has endorsed the Lebanese working paper and presented it to the Arab kings and presidents for their approval. It is known that this working paper calls, among other things, for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon. We note here that unofficial reports coming from Fes indicate that Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad has agreed to end the task of the Syrian forces deployed within the framework of the Arab Deterrent Forces in Lebanon.

It has been learned that the Arab kings and presidents meeting in Fes will wind up their work today with a luncheon given in their honor by the Moroccan ruler, Hassan II. Reports indicate that attempts have succeeded to a great extent in settling most of the Arab differences and that efforts are now being centered on bringing about a reconciliation between Syria and Iraq. A special committee composed of Algeria and the UAE is expected to be formed to settle the Iranian-Iraqi conflict. The summit's final statement is expected to mention financial aid to Lebanon to help in reconstructing what the war had destroyed in cities and villages.

MONTE CARLO SAYS PLO REPORTEDLY MOVING BACK

JN081800 Monte Carlo Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1710 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Telephone dispatch by Radio Monte Carlo correspondent in Beirut George Bashir -- live or recorded]

[Excerpt] While the reports on the Arab summit's stand on the demands contained in the Lebanese working paper call for reassurance, a wave of anxiety and fear prevails among all popular, official and political quarters concerning the situation in northern Lebanon and the Al-Biqa' Valley after diplomatic sources mentioned that Israel had issued a warning to Syria on the tense situation in these two areas.

In the wake of visits by Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf] to Tripoli and Nayif Hawatimah to Ba'labakk yesterday, official information has been received by ranking [Lebanese] officials stating that Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir] and Abu al-Walid [Sa'd Sayil] have been supervising the establishment of new combat positions and bases for Palestinian organizations in the Al-Biqa' Valley and northern Lebanon for the past 3 days. This will increase Lebanese officials' fears about the situation in these two areas because it will provide the excuse Israel is waiting for to carry out military operations.

In any case, the officials have discussed this issue in detail with U.S. Ambassador in Beirut Robert Dillon, who will leave Beirut for Washington tomorrow morning. President Sarkis also sent a written message to Saudi King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz. Cabinet ministers from Al-Biqa' and northern Lebanon proposed today that the Cabinet be convened urgently to discuss the situation in these two areas in light of the new developments and the desire that the Palestinian organizations have expressed to move once again from Syria into Lebanon, despite the fact that Syria, according to information received from Fes, has agreed to withdraw its military forces from Lebanon at Lebanon's official request.

SARKIS, DILLON DISCUSS MULTINATIONAL FORCE

NC081508 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] President Ilyas Sarkis met with U.S. Ambassador Robert Dillon at 1115 today. Foreign Minister Fu'ad Butrus was present. The meeting dealt with the multinational force and the question of its departure upon the completion of the task assigned to it in Beirut, in accordance with the agreement concluded with U.S. envoy Philip Habib for ending the capital's crisis.

It is understood that during the 1-hour meeting, the U.S. ambassador communicated to President Sarkis the U.S. Government's stand regarding the [Lebanese] prime minister's proposal that the multinational force's withdrawal should be simultaneous with the Israeli forces' withdrawal to Khaldah. However, Ambassador Dillon declined to divulge anything about what went on during the discussions. He only said: No comment. The weather is good today.

U.S. Marines To Leave 10 Sep

NC090614 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0530 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] It has been officially announced that the U.S. contingent of the multinational force will withdraw from Beirut on Friday morning. UPI quoted a spokesman of the U.S. force that the Marines should be out of Lebanon by 1000 Friday.

AFP quoted a well-informed source that the Italian and French contingents would not remain long in Beirut after the Marines' withdrawal and that their withdrawal would take place before 16 September.

AL-WAZZAN VIEWS SECURITY MEASURES IN EAST BEIRUT

NC081922 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] In an interview with AL-BAYRAQ, Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan has revealed that talks have begun and preparations are being made for implementing security measures and the deployment of the army in [Beirut] in an operation parallel to the security plan being implemented in Beirut and its southern suburb.

Prime Minister al-Wazzan said the talks being held with the parties concerned in east Beirut appear to be good and positive. The implementation of the security measures in east Beirut will begin with the opening of the Fu'ad Shihab Bridge. I will open the bridge this time from the east to the west, he said.

AL-JUMAYYIL DISCUSSES MEDIA, FOREIGN PAPERS

NC082258 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 2100 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Excerpts] President-elect Shaykh Bashir al-Jumayyil visited the Lebanese television building in Al-Hazimiyah at noon today and spent some time with the workers there, during which welcoming speeches were made by Information Minister Michel Iddih; Charles Rizq, chairman of the Board of Directors and director general of the Lebanese Television Company; 'Arafat Hijazi; and Ilyas Abu Rizq, chairman of the Lebanese Television Employees Union.

The president-elect replied with a long speech which is regarded as a work program for the new regime. He explained his views on information and its future, in addition to the basic and mental rules which must govern the building of a new and strong state which does not fear opposition or constructive criticism, emphasizing his resolve to apply the Lebanese publications law to the letter. Among other things, President-elect al-Jumayyil said: This is the first time we approach an official institution. I would like to tell the television and radio employees that I do not want anyone in the information media to behave like Ahmad Sa'id [Cairo Voice of the Arabs radio commentator] or act on a basis of one-upmanship, concealment of the facts because they are not in our interest or the presentation of deceptions or lies which might soften certain issues which it is believed should be camouflaged in order to let certain things pass quietly. He added: Lebanon has sacrificed 100,000 dead and brought in many armies. What has befallen us was because we did not know how to preserve the truth and because the truth often frightened us.

The president-elect said: You in the television and radio and the rest of the information media have the responsibility of telling the truth because when you make the people, the ruler and the officials believe that everything is in order when in fact it is not, you will be deceiving yourselves, the ruler and public opinion and will not be doing the people a service. I have come to ask you to tell the truth however hard it is, because when we tell the truth, we endeavor to change the situation and to avert all mistakes and unsound practices. The ruler is in need of those who tell the truth. From now on, each one of us has a responsibility which he must shoulder. I hope to apply the principle of reward and punishment. Whoever does his job properly will be rewarded, promoted and respected, and whoever neglects his duty out of good intention will be dealt with in a decent manner. Whoever abuses his duty out of ill intentions will be told: You do not belong here any longer. It is no longer possible whenever a new government takes office for every one of the 24 ministers to bring in his villagers and people and employ them in the administration. The state can no longer tolerate every lawyer or engineer who has failed in his profession or in his life and comes to the state to secure his future in it.

He said the state will help and will establish proper social security. It will establish social bodies to ease the citizens' burden. The president-elect added: However, the administration is not capable of shouldering all these burdens. The administration will thin out and purge, but not in the sense that whoever has not voted for us will be sent home. He added: On the level of information, we ask the states which have newspapers in Lebanon to allow us to tell them that we are no longer able to tolerate this. The states which want newspapers can have them in their own countries but not here. I hope that all the Lebanese newspapers will return to the homeland. It is not necessary for them to be issued in Cyprus, Paris, London or Germany, provided that they are Lebanese. The publications law will be implemented meticulously and so will the censorship stipulated in the law.

QULAYLAT VIEWS DISARMAMENT, POLITICAL SOLUTION

GF060652 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0830 GMT 5 Sep 82

[Text] Abu Dhabi, 5 Sep (WAKH) -- Ibrahim Qulayat, chairman of the Lebanese Independent Nasirite Movement- Al-Murabitun, has affirmed that the Lebanese National Movement will keep its arms as long as there is a single Israeli solder on Lebanese soil.

Commenting on the security plan to gather the militia troops and the fighters in special barracks in Beirut, he said, in today's issue of AL-ITTIHAD, that the movement did what it was required to do according to this plan. The Post Office area and some positions were handed over to the president so the internal security forces can take care of these positions instead of the army, whose task is to repel and confront the enemy. He rejected the possibility of conducting any kind of dialogue with the brigades under the Zionist occupation. He said: When the occupation is over all its results will vanish. This is what we hope and then new factors for this dialogue will emerge.

Regarding his view on a political solution, since the newly elected president, Bashir al-Jumayyil, will soon assume the presidency, he said: The exit of Palestinian fighters from Beirut has added more complications to the issue than the United States and Israel imagined because the Palestinian dispersal and the nature of the Palestinian question have both become more complex. He expressed his belief that any settlement under the Israeli occupation will require at least 2 years to be implemented. The chairman of the Lebanese Independent Nasirite Movement said this is the period during which the U.S. administration hopes to succeed in reaching a settlement within the framework of the Camp David accords.

SHAM'UN, PIERRE AL-JUMAYYIL VIEW CURRENT SITUATION

NC081425 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1130 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The Lebanese Front held its periodic meeting at its headquarters in Dayr 'Awqar this morning to review the current situation. After the meeting, [former] President Camille Sham'un said: We reviewed the political and security situation. We have met with a delegation from Mazra'at ash-Shuf and Al-Baruk townships, which briefed us on the question of the cases submitted to the judicial quarters relating to the bloody incidents following the killing of the late Kamal Junblatt and requested that justice should take its course. Our answer was that if there is cooperation from them and from the government, the authorities should perform their duty. It is hoped that this tragedy would end with a reconciliation that would safeguard the rights and dignity of all parties.

Sham'un added: We have taken note of the security plan implementation.

Asked if he is satisfied with the security plan, Sham'un said: I bless every initiative embarked upon by the Lebanese Army or the internal security forces. I have always encouraged this and wished it success.

Shaykh Pierre al-Jumayyil said: I believe that what led us to this painful situation is the lack of understanding among the Lebanese, which was imposed upon them. This is a strange and most regrettable matter. What is more surprising is the statement issued on the Islamic Grouping meeting that included most of the Muslim personages. The statement included points and stances that no Lebanese can differ on with any other Lebanese. Therefore, we ask: What are the differences on? Shaykh Pierre added: It is known that a meeting was held at the Republican Palace prior to the presidential election. It was attended by [former] President Sham'un, [former] Prime Ministers Sa'ib Salam and Taqiy ad-Din as-Sulh and myself. The conferees reviewed the various current affairs. We did not disagree on any subject then. Here, I support, rather I call for convening a quadripartite meeting in the Republican Palace as Salam proposed to discuss all these matters, particularly after the Islamic Grouping has issued its statement the contents of which we all agree on provided that there is good will and honesty. It must be recalled here that we all had approved the unwritten charter which the Lebanese arrived at in 1943. If this charter was implemented with purely patriotic conscience we would not have reached today's situation. The basis of the charter is Lebanon's independence from the East and the West in addition to maximum cooperation with the Arab world and civilized world. It is time after the experience we passed through that we should understand one another as Lebanese before requesting the help of others.

Shaykh Pierre concluded by repeating that no one in the world can understand the Lebanese question as well as the Lebanese Muslims and the Christians. Therefore, their coming together must take place because 90 percent of the Lebanese are adhering more than at any time before to the Lebanese formula which is a standing civilization by itself.

MAJOR HADDAD INTERVIEWED ON AL-JUMAYYIL, ISRAEL

TA081737 Marj 'Uyun Lebanon Voice of Hope in English 0700 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Interview with Maj Sa'd Haddad by (Chuck Pollack) on 7 September; place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Question] I am speaking with Maj Sa'd Haddad, the leader of Free Lebanon and commander of the Free Lebanese Forces. Major Haddad, on a report it was alleged that the new president-elect of Lebanon now, Bashir al-Jumayyil, and the Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin in their recent talks in Nahariyya talked about the charge that the Lebanese Government was preparing to put you on trial. Now is this so, sir, and what would you say in response to that?

[Answer] First of all before answering I would like to thank the Prime Minister Menahem Begin for his concern in discussing the problem with the new elected president Bashir al-Jumayyil. I would like also to thank the defense minister, Mr Arik Sharon, for the good words that he said about me yesterday in Qiryat Shemona, and I would like to thank all the members of the Israeli Government for the decision that they took to help Lebanon, and it was indeed the only way to help and save Lebanon. On behalf of most of the Lebanese I can thank also the Israeli Government for what they did for us.

I wonder how can Mr Bashir al-Jumayyil ask Menahem Begin to put me on trial for my relations, or public relations, with Israel.

How come he is talking with him, dealing with him and what about in this case we have (? a leader) to attend the trial before me. [as heard] We either don't want to discover all the secrets, there are a lot of secrets that I know about all the Lebanese responsible, the old ones and the new ones. So, I want to keep it in the [word indistinct]. It is nonsense that this kind of question that Major Haddad attends trial. Anyhow, we hope the good reason or the right reason will come back to the new elected president.

We should know, everybody should know that without Israel, and I am sure there were requests for Israel from many Lebanese personalities, from the Lebanese Front to do this operation, and [word indistinct] to save Lebanon, to force the terrorists and the Syrians to leave Lebanon. That is a reason to change all the attitudes, all the customs, all the rules which used to be followed in the past, because all the measures and the decisions used to be taken under the influence of the occupying forces -- the Syrians and the terrorists. So, what happened in Lebanon happened like a white coup d'etat and so everything should change by 180 degrees.

Now the right line should continue to rule, and plus on that, without the Israeli presence in Lebanon, Bashir al-Jumayyil -- with all the respect, love and appreciation I have for him -- he would not be able to be elected as a president. He made benefit from the Israeli presence in Lebanon. We know very well that the deputies who elected him, they are not deputies anymore since [words indistinct] this year they lost their legitimacy and their quality of [word indistinct] the people. But we are glad that Mr Bashir al-Jumayyil was elected even with this illegitimate parliament, because we know Bashir al-Jumayyil is in the same line, we wish to be fighting together for the same causes, and that is not new. These causes, most of the causes, are [word indistinct] on the hand of the IDF and by the approval of the Lebanese Front and us, and we know very well what Free Lebanon [word indistinct] to mean for all Lebanese [passage indistinct].

Now we should not go too far: It is enough for anybody to go to any village from the new liberated villages and to see the citizens, how happy they are and how they are living and how much confidence they have in the future. So, I think it is nonsense to speak of trial and dealing as a traitor, dealing with the enemy, and we know what this enemy did not only for Free Lebanon but for all Lebanon, for all Lebanese people and also for the new elected president that I wish for him all success and I wish he will be able to liberate all the country and to establish the sovereignty upon all Lebanese ground and the independence also.

[Question] Major Haddad, there have been 40 private armies -- so they say -- in Lebanon. What do you propose happens now in Lebanon with all of the different militias, what do you propose, what should happen now?

[Answer] I am now for a Lebanese Army that should be one army controlling all Lebanon and these things should be discussed on the table, everything should be put on the table. I believe that there should be some changes in the organization of the army, because there was a lot of mistakes in the constitution of that army, so I believe there should be a committee, well qualified and able to make some reorganization of the order and laws of the army, and each one of the militias should have the facility and the right to enter this army if he wants to freely and voluntarily. If not, he can come back to civilian life. All of them should be mixed in one organization under the name of the Lebanese Army.

But to take for example this militia, [words indistinct] this is the base of the army and should be working in the same way together without being [word indistinct] or dissolved or mixed with other populations.

It will not work. It will always have a special color. So, that's what I said, for that there should be some mixture of all the people who want to join the new army, where should be a new basis. [Words indistinct] anyhow, whatever will be, we have the army of Free Lebanon which is based on these bases: The army should be for all Lebanon and for all Lebanese, and should have in its ranks all kinds of Lebanese as we used to do it. In fact, you can find in our army, in the army of Free Lebanon, all origins without any distinction living together, even fighting together, in the same position. They have one principle in their head -- the benefit and the serving of Lebanon. They can take this army as [word indistinct] for the future Lebanese Army. We are ready to help in that if they want.

[Question] Major Haddad, one more question. It has been 7 long years and you have been the commander of the Free Lebanese Army for many years. There was a struggle and many of you held out in this area for such a long time. What are your feelings now? What are your feelings now concerning the situation in Lebanon? What do you feel personally?

[Answer] Personally, I feel really very satisfied and I feel peace coming on my spirit, because most of the things I was struggling for, I feel that most of them are all right now. And I see from the people coming from all the parts of Lebanon coming to me, to touch Major Haddad or to touch the hand of Major Haddad and take the benedictions from him like a holy man, for what I did for them. That proves what I used to say always: 90 percent of the Lebanese believe in our cause -- it is true and you can touch it by your hand. That is a very big reward, it is priceless reward given to me saying that [words indistinct] all the things happening, fulfilled and achieved. My biggest reward will be when all the Lebanese country will be free and unified, independent senior [as heard]. Afterward, you know I already said that many times, I consider that I did my duty toward my country, toward my people, and I can rest peacefully in my house.

[Question] Thank you, Major Haddad for taking the time. I appreciate your being with us.

[Answer] You are welcome, you are all welcome.

PLO, CIVILIAN CASUALTY FIGURES REPORTED

NC032134 Paris AFP in English 2112 GMT 3 Sep 82

[Text] Nicosia, Sep 3 (AFP) -- Nearly 8.5 percent of Palestinians in Lebanon were killed or wounded during the Israeli invasion, the Palestinian News Agency WAFA reported in a dispatch monitored here. The agency said 500 Palestinian soldiers were killed and 1,500 wounded in the fighting. Overall, WAFA said, nearly 48,000 persons were killed or wounded in the offensive, including 25,000 Palestinian and 15,000 Lebanese civilians. The agency said the heaviest casualties were recorded in Beirut and Sidon in southern Lebanon where the largest Palestinian refugee camps are located.

West Beirut Casualties

NC072028 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 2015 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] It has been learned from a source closely linked to the United Nations in Beirut that 6,775 persons were killed and 30,000 persons were wounded in west Beirut between 6 June and 15 August during the Israeli-Palestinian-Syrian military operations.

KNESSET DEBATES LEBANON WAR, REAGAN PLAN

Sharon Address

TA080901 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0711 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Speech by Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon opening the special Knesset debate on Operation Peace for Galilee -- live]

[Text] Your Honor Mr Speaker, respected Knesset [members]: At the beginning of my remarks, I would like to state here, from the Knesset podium, that the campaign to expel the PLO terrorist organizations from west Beirut has been successfully completed. They, their headquarters, their commanders and their personnel have been expelled and dispersed throughout eight different countries, some of them straight into special temporary prisons built in advance in those countries.

Another result, a great and essential one, of Operation Peace for Galilee, which has no precedent in the history of the wars, is that a nation rose up against a terrorist organization which set out, from within its own kingdom, on the most cruel attacks against Israel and the world for many years, and simply expelled it from the capital of its kingdom. This accomplishment is rare in the annals of the nations and the wars for freedom and liberty and will not be quickly forgotten. On the one hand, it will serve as a lesson to those sowing terror and death, and on the other, it will serve as a symbol, as a sign and an object of wonder for other nations whose security, safety and the lives of their citizens are dear to them. The renewed Israel has given to the Free World many signs and wonders, in this field, too. I will enumerate them: the capture of the criminal Adolf Eichmann, a supreme symbol of the punishment of the perpetrator of destruction of the Jewish people; the release of the Entebbe hostages as an example of nonsurrender to terrorism; the destruction of the Iraqi reactor as a model of non-acceptance of a dangerous threat to destroy Israel. And now, the complete expulsion of the Palestinian terrorist organizations as proof of our absolute determination to fight it to the bitter end, not to accept it and not to compromise with it.

I will not be exaggering if I say that there is not one other country in the world that can boast of such skill in fighting and such successes, with a supreme universal moral value, like little Israel. Perhaps it is just because it is small and because it arose from the ashes of pogroms and destruction that its continued existence in peace and security is more keen for it than it is for any other nation. Perhaps it is because most of Israel's citizens understand very well that the PLO and its supporters have engraved on their flag the slogan of its destruction. It would not have been possible to attain this amazing achievement -- which is causing an earthquake in the area, which delivered a heavy military and political blow to the PLO and expelled it from west Beirut -- without our nation's determination, without the IDF, its soldiers and commanders putting pressure on west Beirut to the last moment -- and sitting there now, too -- without our fighters showing an unusual amount of wisdom and sacrifice, as they have done.

From this podium we salute the fallen of the IDF who gave their lives in this campaign against regional and international terror, against the organized terror its supporters used mercilessly against us for years. The agony of the bereaved families is our agony. I hope, together with all of us here, that the wounded will recover rapidly and return to their homes and their families. Yes, there is a heavy price to be paid for the achievement of our security and safety. In each and every generation, as now, as well, we ask ourselves, mothers and fathers: Will our sons, too, go to war? Will there be an end to killing? And I say: We have not been sentenced to live by the sword alone forever and ever.

However, this will be true only on one condition: if we are wise enough to understand the foundations and principles of the establishment of the people in its country. This condition includes our willingness to use, at any time, the natural right to self-defense, which is a moral right. This condition includes the belief in our rightness and our right to fight for this country with endurance, with patience, with the ability to endure a protracted struggle.

If we do not do this today, there will not be anyone to do this tomorrow. If we do not bear this heavy burden on our shoulders, the burden will be infinitely heavier for our children. In each and every generation, we must lessen the burden of risks to our safety and security and increase the chances and hope for those who will follow us. The expulsion of the terrorists from west Beirut, like the other achievements of Operation Peace for Galilee, from the destruction of the infrastructure of the terrorists in southern and central Lebanon, the destruction of the Syrian missiles, planes and tanks, cannot be described without mentioning the skill of the leadership and the courageous decisionmaking by the Cabinet headed by Menahem Begin.

This is a Cabinet that successfully passed the test, in these months, too, a test that has been experienced by very few Israeli governments; a Cabinet that was involved in making every important operational decision throughout the war and, at the same time, in contrast to our previous wars, ensured, like the General Staff itself, that there was no tension between the political and the military echelons; that we, both sides, worked and labored during the long and difficult months in full harmony, with a consistent aim at achieving the war's objectives which were clearly defined and fully attained.

We were able to attain this achievement and watch, all of us, the expulsion armada working with perfect order from the port of Beirut because the nation showed unusual maturity, as befits an ancient nation that is refounding its life and its state in Eretz Yisra'el, as befits a recruited people, an army of reservists, all of them bearing the heavy burden of the war of defense.

There are nations that know how to honor themselves with a national achievement and be proud of it with heads held high, without hitting at the achievement and harming it, even if their share in it was small.

I have read and heard that Philip Habib was awarded yesterday by our friend, U.S. President Ronald Reagan, the Medal of Freedom as the savior of Beirut and its inhabitants. As one who for more than 2 months negotiated with Ambassador Habib on the agreement for the expulsion of the terrorists from Beirut, I can send him best wishes for having received the medal.

You, citizens of Israel, are worthy not of the Medal of Freedom, but of the memorial of freedom, a special memorial for your decisive role in the expulsion of the terrorists and, as an end result, the saving of Beirut and its inhabitants and Lebanon in general from the terrorist center, which they controlled without limit.

[MK Tawfiq Tubi, RAKAH, heckles from the Knesset hall, condemning the Beirut fighting as the massacre of a people. The Knesset speaker tries to stop him from shouting.]

Before they try to distort history, it would be better for it to be clearly stated here and now, that for all our gratitude to the Marines, to the soldiers of France and Italy for directing traffic in the expulsion campaign, it would not have occurred at all without the nation of Israel. Not one diplomat or foreign statesman, and I am not, for the moment, speaking about Israelis, imagined 1 day before Operation Peace for Galilee, and for many days after it broke out, that the terrorist PLO would be expelled from Beirut. On the contrary.

In the corridors of the Foreign Ministries of Western Europe, and even in the United States, the voices of the so-called experts who searched for any way to try to compensate the archterrorist Yasir 'Arafat and his gang of friends had the upper hand. But the people of Israel decided otherwise and did what was seen by many others as an impossible task: to expel the PLO from Beirut. Not to Tripoli, not to the Al-Biqa', but to eight different countries and thus to destroy the terrorists' country that threatened us from within range of artillery and katyushas. Therefore, the nation is worthy of special freedom memorials and every fighter...

[MK Biton, HADASH, heckles from Knesset benches, apparently asking Sharon why he does not say that the genuine aim was Bashir al-Jumayyil.]

...Therefore, the nation is worthy of special freedom memorials and every fighter deserves a special medal, the Medal of the Cedars of Lebanon. Except that we are not a nation that has free time for memorials, medals and honors, because the burden on our shoulders -- our struggle to exist in peace and security -- is still great.

I will try to describe the last stages that overcame the terrorists and led them to the decision to uproot themselves from west Beirut without any further fighting. Up to 1 August, the terrorist organizations were still busy with attempts to cheat us all, including mediator Philip Habib, in an attempt to freeze the situation and remain in west Beirut. Therefore, the IDF stepped up the siege on the terrorism center. Between 1 and 5 August, the IDF tightened its pressure on the terrorist deployment in southwest Beirut. The airfield was conquered, the Hayy as-Sullum area was conquered, which was a Shi'ite area at first and later became a terrorist center. We took over the terrorist center in Al-Awza'i, which was the focus of terrorist naval activity against Israel for years. IDF units reached very near the heart of the terrorist area near the city stadium. The IDF made a small and predefined movement, took control of the Museum near the Hippodrome and the terrorist stronghold in Burj al-Barajinah was encircled on three sides.

These movements created the correct impression for the terrorists, that the IDF was determined to isolate the terrorists' areas south of the city of west Beirut, areas that were a home not only for the center of the regional terror, but a center of international terror.

Those same days the air force was also used intensively and the navy also worked efficiently. On Sunday, 1 August, the air force made 127 attacks against terrorist areas and their hosts, mainly in the area south of the city of Beirut, against those same terrorist areas. It also attacked their command headquarters and indeed, after this comprehensive IDF activity, the terrorists, on 6 August, for the first time, reached the conclusion that they would really have to leave west Beirut.

However, the conditions presented by them still could not have been accepted. As they did during most of the negotiations, through the good services of the United States and Ambassador Philip Habib, the terrorists continued, at the same time, with cease-fire violations. Despite their desire to continue to discuss the conditions for their departure from Beirut and perhaps in order to guarantee that their conditions be accepted, the terrorists continued activity against our forces. It was clear to us that we must not permit them to fire under cover of the negotiations and hit our soldiers, just as it was clear that we must use counterpressure.

There was a sophisticated and perfect use by us of a combination of military and political measures. Already on 1 August the Cabinet made decision No 796, which states: A) The prime minister will report to Ambassador Arens, who will inform the U.S. Government, that Israel is prepared for a cease-fire in Lebanon on the specific condition that it will be a complete and mutual cease-fire.

B) If the terrorists violate the cease-fire, the IDF will react on land, in the air and on the sea.

Between 6 and 12 August, the terrorists' cease-fire violations continued. The IDF continued its pressure on Beirut this time, mainly through bombing and shelling of the terrorists' command headquarters, the Syrians and their weapons system until 12 August. On 9 August, the air force carried out 36 attacks. On 10 August, 16 attacks were made and on 11 August the air force carried out another 16 attacks. Almost all the attacks were concentrated on the region of the terrorists' camps, where there were almost no civilians staying, and south of the Corniche al-Mazra'ah. On 12 August, the air force made 72 attacks. This shows you that the heaviest day of bombardment was not 12 August, but 1 August, when, as I said, 127 attacks were made.

In parallel with this intensive activity by the IDF, beginning on 1 August and up to 12 August, we deployed and concentrated forces around Beirut. It is worth repeating here what we have emphasized and pointed out more than once, that we did not want to break into west Beirut. We wanted to lead to the uprooting of the terrorists without any need to break into the city of Beirut. However, we knew that the terrorists would reach the final conclusion to uproot themselves from Beirut only if they believed that we were prepared to go to the end, if there was a need for this, that is, to conquer west Beirut.

Here I will bring you the words of pilot Ahi'az on this matter [Israeli pilot captured and later released] as they were broadcast on television on 27 August, a few days after he was released from his captivity by the terrorists. We knew early on, from authoritative and reliable sources, what Ahi'az disclosed in that broadcast, at a time when the expulsion was already at its peak, but the words of one who was in the terrorists' hands for many days and showed perfect ability to stand firm, are important. Ahi'az said, in reply to the question, did the terrorists believe that the IDF would enter Beirut, and I quote: I believed at the beginning, and I was also told this, that this was a fraud. They built a great deal on what happened here in Israel, particularly the massive opposition there was here in Israel to an entry in to Beirut. They built enormously on this. End of quotation.

Well, in view of this mood of the terrorists...

[Heckling from the Knesset benches, interrupting Sharon; the Knesset speaker demands silence]

Well, in view of this mood of the terrorists, it was clear that the only way to avoid the need to enter west Beirut was to make all the preparations to enter Beirut, including deploying and concentrating forces, including preparing detailed plans and setting various dates for implementation throughout the period.

The calling up of reserves was done in accordance with all the codes and laws and in accordance with the Cabinet decisions. The IDF had to be prepared for any possibility and the possible dates that had been set. If a situation had been created that would have forced us to take this final measure and break into west Beirut, you can be absolutely sure that we would have discussed this in a governmental plenum.

However, this complicated and difficult, complicated, military, diplomatic and, I would say, psychological fight bore fruit without there being any need to decide on taking the path we did not want, that is, entering west Beirut. Already in the second week of August the terrorists, to the best of our knowledge, had reached the following conclusions, as a result of this activity by us. The departure from west Beirut became for the PLO, a strategic question involving -- here I am using language used by the terrorists and they are not exactly the terms we use -- the departure from west Beirut became for the PLO a strategic question involving guarding the lives of both the cadres and the leaders, particularly after most of their heavy ammunition and antiaircraft weapons had been used up.

No military or civilian supplies had reached them as a result of the tightening of the siege by Israel. The terrorists described their situation as one of suicide, and only since the United States cannot or is not interested, in their opinion -- I am here using their own words, these sections are taken from the terrorists' words -- particularly since the United States cannot or is not interested, in their opinion, in putting pressure on Israel to honor the cease-fire -- but the terrorists do not commit suicide.

All those descriptions of Massada, Stalingrad and the Warsaw ghetto are an insult to glory and heroism when they try to compare them with the behavior of the terrorists in Beirut. Between 12-13 August, after another day of bombing of the terrorists' deployments, they accepted our conditions and this is the picture that crystallized for the terrorists following Habib's contacts in Beirut on 12 August, as it appears in one of our official documents, which reflects the position of the terrorists at dawn on Friday, 13 August.

Habib brought the terrorists an ultimatum according to which they had to reply that very night, 12-13 August, to his demand [derishato] that the multinational force should reach Beirut only after the withdrawal of at least 50 percent of the terrorists under the supervision of the Lebanese Army and without international guarantees to defend them and the refugee camps. However, it will be said in a word, what does that mean, defense for the refugee camps? In fact, what was the terrorists' condition? The terrorists' condition was the entrance of a multinational force from the beginning of a withdrawal -- in quotes, because, after all, they were sitting there -- by the terrorists to their camps and the defense of the multinational force of them, meaning: the creation of a buffer zone between it and the IDF and then an entry into negotiations with the Government of Lebanon over the evacuation arrangements.

During the night of 12-13 August, Philip Habib told them something completely different: He gave them an ultimatum that same night. This is what he told them. Habib, in fact, retracted what he had agreed upon with the terrorists. The terrorists' position was that the multinational force would arrive with the beginning of their withdrawal from Beirut. And I am continuing with the quotation: Israel's objective is, in fact, the foiling of any political solution and the continuation of the massacre and killing of the terrorists in Beirut. All the more so as Habib informed them that the current cease-fire was for only 48 hours. End of quotation. We are not responsible for the terrorists' impressions as they appeared in the third clause that I quoted. Habib apparently told them this on his own initiative, as another means of pressure in view of what had happened on 12 August. What is important is that that same night, at midnight, on 12-13 August, the terrorists accepted the fact that they would have to leave Beirut, conceding all their conditions. The expulsion of the terrorist PLO from Beirut became a fact.

Israel and the entire area are standing on the threshold of a new era which, even if it involves difficult struggles, necessarily brings with it a great chance for peace and security, more than ever. As a result of our victory over terrorism, the capital of Lebanon has been liberated and the Lebanese people, for whom we feel great friendship, have been liberated from the conqueror's heel. For the first time in years, there is a chance that a stable government will be established there, since it has been possible to hold the presidential elections and elect a young, new president without any interference. Our army is in Lebanon not as an army of conquest, but as an army of liberation. It is being accepted as a friendly army, with the feeling that the future of both countries depends on the peace treaty and security arrangements to be achieved directly between them, without mediators. That does not mean that we cannot expect struggles, all of us, but the goals can be achieved. They are within our grasp, more than ever before.

First, the expulsion of the terrorists from Lebanon, together with the Syrian Army, in the framework of the removal from Lebanon of all foreign forces.

If we insist on this, if we demonstrate patience as we have so far, up to the expulsion of the murderers' organizations from Beirut, then we will also see the removal of the terrorists and the Syrians from all of Lebanon. This will ensure that this neighboring and friendly country will no longer serve as a springboard for terror against us. We will also seek -- and I believe that we will achieve it -- peace with Lebanon, an open border between the countries. Peace is not a gesture by one country to another, it is a security need.

And, in any event, in order to guarantee that the inhabitants of the north will no longer have to live in shelters, and so that their children can grow up and be educated like every other child in Israel, we will guarantee a security strip and security arrangements of 40 to 50 km -- a strip free of threatening artillery pieces and other means of terrorism. It must already be clear, and we have learned from experience -- many details became known to us on this matter actually during the war and during the long months after it -- that neither UNIFIL nor a multinational force will be able to give us this security. The security arrangements will include steps that will prevent Lebanon from again turning into a terrorism center.

This is what will happen to Lebanon, assuming that we continue to show obstinacy and patience and, mainly, unite our ranks, as befits a people that is fighting for its existence, its security and its safety. Every time that we have done this, we have gained. We achieved peace with Egypt. We changed the map of Judaea and Samaria. We destroyed the nuclear threat in Baghdad and now we have expelled the terrorist PLO from Beirut.

Our people can be proud of all this, but it would be advisable for us not to rest on our laurels. There is still a long way to go. Now there is an attempt to impose on us a plan contradicting our national interests and also contradicting the agreements we signed with Egypt and the United States at Camp David, where we promised autonomy to the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el. I do not intend to intrude into the foreign minister's field. We will speak on this issue today. But it is impossible not to deduce from what occurred in Lebanon, what could happen in Judaea and Samaria if we accept even a part of the proposals being suggested to us now and I will touch on this in a few words.

We can say that we are standing on the threshold of another firm struggle for Eretz Yisra'el, but under more convenient conditions. We were not surprised by this plan, since many months ago we assessed that after the Sinai evacuation, after the heavy price we paid for the peace treaty with Egypt, there would be some people among our friends in the United States who would show impatience and try to bring about changes that are not covered by the Camp David agreements. With all our great friendship for the United States, there, too, there is sometimes impatience and an incomprehensible lack of willingness to wait, incomprehensible to anyone who actually lives in this area, experiences its problems and bears the burden and the results of every mistaken decision.

The notions of changing the Camp David agreements are already being heard in the United States. In my opinion, Operation Peace for Galilee only postponed the presentation of the U.S. plan by several months. It could have been expected and it would have been better had the plan not been submitted at all, because a new situation has been created. The terrorist PLO has been beaten politically and militarily and we would have now proceeded, and we will yet proceed with more optimism, with finding partners to a plan that will lead to coexistence in peace with the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el.

We have been asked more than once, and I have been asked personally, what in fact is the danger to Israel from that small thing -- and let us for the moment translate this into the same language in which it was stated -- from that small, demilitarized thing that will be established in Judaea and Samaria. What will the danger be?

It is interesting that after the war in Lebanon, I think that everyone with any sense can see what the grave danger of that thing is. There are those who often throw figures around about the Palestinians who live in Lebanon.

I want to rely on one figure, the UNRWA figure. The UNRWA figure speaks of 275,000 Palestinians who live in Lebanon. That is UNRWA's figure.

Generally speaking they, as a rule, do not decrease but increase the figures. Let us accept this figure. In other words, we have about 300,000 -- perhaps fewer -- Palestinians living in Lebanon. These 300,000 Palestinians living in Lebanon managed to set up an armed force, organized into units of 25,000 members. In addition, they set up armed militia, involving more than 40,000, which took part in the fighting. In question is a Palestinian population of 300,000 or less people.

It seems that when one comes to handle such a problem, one immediately encounters additional elements. It is not something minor which can always be handled when something happens. It seems that the terrorists operate among civilians, and when one operates among civilians an effort must be made not to hit civilians. In this regard, the IDF made efforts such as have never been made in other wars, nor will be made in any other wars, by any people and by any army. It is only the Jewish people who were prepared to pay the price they paid in order to avoid hitting civilians and keeping such hits down to a minimum, and we regret even this minimum.

However, there are additional factors here, not just the civilian factor. There are superpowers which are active. As we have now seen: Superpowers are intervening. There are communications media. Today's world is different. Everything reverberates. Today when we see west Beirut on our television, we see it intact and we know it is intact since we have not touched the city [last word in English] of Beirut except in unusual cases, for specific purposes. I think I would not be mistaken if I were to say here that we have surely hit the terrorists' areas. This too bears no comparison to what has been publicized. But, according to investigations we conducted, as well as aerial photographs, there were 40 houses destroyed by us in west Beirut, namely, in the city of Beirut and not in the terrorists' areas. I would like to tell you that this number of 40 houses is out of all of west Beirut which was about 23,000 to 24,000 houses. It is a pity to have any house or any person killed or injured. However, matters were presented without any foundation and any proportions. Therefore, when one speaks of this minor thing ... [Interrupted by heckling by HADASH MK Tawfiq Tubi and by Alignment MK Jacques Amir]

I would not like to answer these interjections. I would like to present things seriously. What I would like to emphasize here is that we operated under today's circumstances. Terrorists live within a civilian population, and we are people anxious to avoid injuring civilians. The war is open to the communications media in the fashion they want to present it, and not in the fashion you want it presented, and sometimes not exactly with pure intentions, I am not speaking of our communications media but of communications media in general. We have superpowers in the region; the Soviets may be involved just as the Americans are. Arab countries can give aid as they did.

We had no intention of dealing with Syrians in this war. We made it clear to the Syrians that we had no intention of fighting them. We have not even demanded [tava'nu] the withdrawal of the Syrians. We demanded [tava'nu] the removal of the terrorists to a range of 40 km away from our northern border in the Al-Biqa' region. This is what we demanded. However, Syria was involved in the war. Luckily, we succeeded. Indeed, I would say that was one of our greatest achievements, to localize this war to the Lebanese border and not let it develop into an all-out war.

However, everything we saw in Lebanon now must signal a thousand alarms as to the danger inherent in the so-called minor, demilitarized thing which may emerge.

When the question is asked: What comparison does this bear to Israel's military power? My response is always: Our victory over the PLO is political rather than military, since the IDF has strength. The IDF is an army with enormous power. The problem here is not one of struggle between the IDF and terrorists. This is not the problem. There are so many other factors in this issue. I emphasize that the achievement is basically political since it should be understood that the PLO, without the ability of perpetrating terror, is unable to achieve any of its objectives. Its ability to achieve its goals lies in its ability to perpetrate terror and murder. This it could do from Lebanon, but it is impossible to do [this] when it is dispersed. This does not mean that there will be no more terrorism. We have given no commitment or guarantees to the PLO that we will not continue to attack it wherever it may be, if it does not truly learn its lesson.

However, to our regret, the new plan exists. The new-world plan was submitted and we justly rejected it. Now at least, we will be able to cope with it with less pressure, without the PLO's terror pistol pointing at our brow from Beirut and from southern Lebanon. Imagine that if we had to struggle against this mistaken plan with the terrorist PLO occasionally directing fire at our settlements in the north and planning terrorist acts throughout Israel from its Beirut center. We would have then surely been urged to accept the U.S. plan and then, lo and behold, the terror would disappear, as it were.

Therefore, another positive byproduct of Operation Peace for Galilee is that we will struggle against the U.S. plan without the terrorist pressure as we had known it. We will struggle until we manage to convince others that our way, our plans are the just ones. We have no war with the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el. We should live in peace throughout Eretz Yisra'el, on the coastal plain and in the Galilee, in Judaea, Samaria, in the Jordan Valley and on the Golan Heights with the aim of obtaining peace on both sides of the Jordan. We have embarked on the right path. Any outside intervention for the purpose of imposing a solution may endanger the entire peace process which the signing of the Camp David accords, the signing of the peace treaty with Egypt and the expulsion of the PLO from Beirut have promoted and accelerated.

We will do everything in our power to maintain this process, and I am convinced we will succeed just as we succeeded in our deadly war against the terrorist PLO in Lebanon.

Bar-Lev Address

TA081516 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0759 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Speech to the Knesset by Labor Party Secretary General Hayim Bar-Lev on Operation Peace for Galilee — live]

[Text] Mr Knesset Speaker, honorable Knesset: The controversy, the differences of opinion and the different presentations about the necessity and justice of the military operation in Lebanon have accompanied it from the beginning. After the evacuation of the terrorists from Beirut and the cessation of the fighting in Lebanon, these questions can now be approached more freely and with a certain retrospective view. The military campaign in Lebanon since the beginning of June can be divided into three stages. The first is from the attempt to assassinate Ambassador Argov until the heavy shelling of the northern settlements. The second stage is from the shelling until the pushing of the terrorists beyond the point from which their cannon and katyushas could reach the settlements. The third stage is from the achievement of this objective until the end of the military campaign is Lebanon.

The attempted assassination of our ambassador in London was carried out by a group that had broken away from the PLO and whose source is not even in Lebanon. Israel's reaction was the bombing of terrorist objectives in Lebanon, to which the PLO reacted by bombarding the northern settlements, after which came Operation Peace for Galilee.

As for the question of whether this development was necessary there are those who answer yes and there are those who answer no.

In contrast, Knesset members, as for the second stage of the campaign, the stage when the northern settlements were subjected to heavy shelling, it was acceptable -- and it is acceptable today -- that there was no escaping a military action aimed at freeing the settlements from the terrorists' fire and threat. A military move for this purpose was necessary and just, and this was acknowledged by the majority in Israel. Also, those outside of Israel showed a certain amount of understanding for the Israeli approach, and as long as the campaign for peace in the Galilee was conducted within those parameters, no criticism was made of Israel's decision to act.

The differences of opinion in Israel and international criticism began when it became clear that Israel was continuing beyond the vital and agreed-upon objective of pushing the terrorists back to a distance of 40 to 45 km. The argument is not over the use of the IDF to obtain peace in the Galilee. There is broad agreement on this. The argument is over the use of force to obtain objectives beyond just peace in the Galilee; the argument is over the moral and image implications that the continued fighting had. For the first time since the state was established, we became involved in a military campaign whose objectives were not a security need vital to Israel's existence or safety.

In the past, Israel embarked on war when it was attacked or when the maintenance of one of its vital interests was prevented. In the war of independence, in the war of attrition and in the October war, Israel was attacked and it fought back. In the 1956 Sinai campaign and in the 1967 6-day war, An-Nasir's Egypt prevented freedom of navigation to Elat by blockading the Straits of Tiran. Israel regarded the freedom of navigation to Elat as a vital national interest; and since no political solution could be found, despite the period of waiting in suspense, Israel went to war to secure a vital national interest which was acceptable and agreed upon: that is, the freedom of navigation to Elat.

Up until the war in Lebanon, Israel never went to war in order to capture territory or to take over natural resources or in order to make good historical rights or in order to influence regimes in Arab countries; it only fought when attacked or for the sake of ensuring an agreed-upon national interest. In all the wars so far, no arguments on the justification or the necessity of using force ever surfaced; and, in general, the world understood this and accepted it. Not so at the third stage of the Lebanon campaign. Here many think that the war continued for the purpose of achieving objectives that were not essential, that were not a matter of life or death for us.

Mr Speaker, even though it would be desirable to have a stable government in Lebanon and for the Syrians and terrorists to leave Lebanon, Israel's security or the safety of the Galilee settlements do not depend on either of these developments. Therefore, they are not essential objectives justifying the use of the IDF's enormous military power. In this respect, Israel was faced with a change in its security conception. If thus far it was customary to activate the IDF only to secure Israel's direct safety, then in the Lebanese campaign the IDF was also activated in order to obtain objectives that are not essential for Israel's security, albeit desirable. Even though the Likud government and the Likud spokesmen themselves never claimed that Israel went to war in order to establish a government in Lebanon that would make peace with Israel or in order to drive the Syrians out of Lebanon, still the acts of the Government of Israel were, and still are, aimed at obtaining this goal.

The entry into Beirut cannot be explained only as being intended to smash the head of the PLO snake. Peace in the Galilee settlements is independent of the existence or nonexistence of PLO commands or bases in Beirut. Peace in the Galilee settlements depends on the nonpresence of the terrorists in a territory from which they could shell the settlements.

Today, Knesset members, it is clear that the PLO cannot be broken through a military action and that Palestinian terrorism -- and I say this with great pain and with sorrow -- did not end with the departure of the terrorists from Beirut.

The cut-off of the Beirut-Damascus highway and the entry into Beirut were, thus, not aimed only at removing the terrorists from there, but were also intended to create the conditions and to prepare the ground for the establishment of a new government, one to Israel's liking. The massive bombing and shelling of Beirut no doubt made things more difficult for the terrorists caught there, but the military principle that resulted from it did not justify the damage caused to Israel. The destruction of Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, the killing of Lebanese civilians and inhabitants, who are not our enemies and with whom we have no war, was not accepted by the world, especially not in view of the fact that those who conducted the negotiations toward the removal of the terrorists from Beirut -- Mr Habib and the Lebanese leaders who dealt with it -- argued persistently that a total cease-fire is essential for the political negotiations to succeed. The defense minister's contention that the terrorists besieged in Beirut were the ones who violated the cease-fire was found to be completely groundless. On Thursday, 12 August, in the afternoon, when the U.S. President demanded [darash] that the prime minister end the firing at once, and the Israeli Government bent over and complied, the fire was halted and the negotiations over the removal of the terrorists from Beirut reached a positive conclusion.

The justification of the bombings of Beirut by the kinds of comparisons Prime Minister Begin had to use do not hold water or solve the problems of Israel's image in the eyes of the world, or the question of the national conscience that many of us have. The comparison drawn between the bombing of Beirut and the bombing of the towns in Nazi Germany during World War II, or the comparison of the damage caused to the inhabitants of Lebanon as a result of our operation with the horrors the PLO caused are irrelevant, and I spoke about this at an earlier debate, so I will not go into it further now. However, the prime minister added to these two irrelevant comparisons still another, to which I will address myself in a few sentences.

In his reply to a motion to the Knesset agenda 4 weeks ago, when we urged an end to the bombings of Beirut, the prime minister argued that during Alignment governments' terms, too, Arab cities were bombed. As a parenthetical remark, Knesset members, it would be worthwhile to remember that if the Cabinet had accepted the Alignment's call 4 weeks ago during the morning debate, urging it to end the bombings, we would have spared ourselves the adamant approach -- to use a mild phrase -- by the U.S. President which arrived a few hours after the Knesset debate, ending the bombings of Beirut.

Mr Speaker, I looked into the issue of the bombings in the past, and it transpired that from the 6-day war up until the campaign in Lebanon, only in the Yom Kippur war did we use planes to attack a military objective in an Arab town. At that time, the Syrian Air Force command in Damascus was attacked from the air, but under no circumstances can this resemble the continual and heavy aerial attacks on Beirut. This was one solitary air attack as part of an all-out war against Syria and its army. In the war of attrition, aircraft never raided cities around the Suez Canal, and the evacuation of the civilians from there was carried out by an edict from the Egyptian Government before that country decided to launch the war of attrition. The attempt to justify the actions in Beirut with the argument that such things have already happened does not pass the test of reality and constitutes yet another example of the distortion of facts together with the hope -- perhaps the assumption -- that the public has a short memory. However, occasionally it is a duty to refresh the public's memory.

Knesset members, how did it come about that Operation Peace for Galilee developed into a siege of Beirut and to continouous bombings of the capital of Lebanon, nearly 100 km from the border? Did the Cabinet adopt a resolution in advance to reach Beirut, and only for reasons of secrecy and field security not disclose this publicly?

Or was the Cabinet itself also faced with a fait accompli from actual government circles?

There is no clear answer to this question. My assessment is that the Cabinet in its entirety did not decide a priori to glide beyond the limited objectives, agreed upon and accepted, of Operation Peace for Galilee. However, when this objective was obtained in the first few days of the fighting, and the United States remained silent -- contrary to the prediction -- and the Syrian Army did not lose control, the government approved additional moves that were brought before it by the defense minister with purely operational reasoning without his telling the government how the military move that was endorsed was incoprorated within the grand scheme. When the Cabinet members found out that the IDF was on the outskirts of Beirut, and that the Syrian Army was disconnected from it, the ministers realigned along the defense minister's views. The thesis maintaining that it was the terrorists who initiated the cease-fire violations, and that we do not necessarily return in kind, was accepted by the Cabinet, making it possible to continue the progress and the bombing of Beirut up until the time when the United States put its foot down.

Then the bombings ended and the fire was halted. This fact, Knesset members, contradicts the explanations provided by the defense minister to the effect that the cease-fire violations in Beirut were the result of the terrorists' initiative. If these were the results of the terrorists' initiative, despite the fact that Israel stopped the bombings, they would no doubt have continued. The fact of the matter is that the cease-fire became effective in Beirut the moment we [with emphasis] stopped advancing and shooting.

Knesset members, only the future will tell what objectives will be attained following the terrorists' evacuation of Beirut. What is essential for the defense and safety of the Galilee settlements is only one single thing, and that is that the area adjacent to the border -- from which the settlements can be hit -- remain clear and free of terrorists. This is a direct security interest, on the achievement of which there was, and is, broad national consensus. If the Lebanese Government is able to guarantee this, all the better; but if not, a solution should be found through a multinational force or by any other reasonable fashion to leave this area free of terrorists. Compared with this goal, which is vital for peace in the Galilee, the other objectives -- although their attainment is desirable -- are not vital either to Israel's security or for the well-being of the Galilee settlements. A strong and independent government in Lebanon and the removal of the Syrians and the ouster of all the terrorists from Lebanon -- all these are desirable goals, even highly desirable, but none of them is essential for Israel's security or for the safety of the settlements.

Knesset members, Lebanon has never been a security problem for Israel. In none of the past wars were we in danger from Lebanon, so that in this sense there is no difference, in terms of the point of view of our security, if there is formal peace between Israel and Lebanon, or if there will only be the Good Fence. Peace with Lebanon is no doubt very much desirable to us, and if it is guaranteed, we will all welcome it. However, from the direct security aspect, Lebanon constitutes no problem for Israel, never has, and the Israeli security depth will not be limited even if peace is signed with Lebanon.

The presence of the Syrian Army in Lebanon truly affects Lebanon's own affairs, but as far as Israel is concerned and in terms of Israel's security this presence has no real significance. On the contrary, it is possible to argue -- as some do -- that the separation of the Syrian Army and its dispersal is preferable to the concentration of all of it opposite the Golan Heights.

As for the ouster of the terrorists from Lebanon, from all of it -- from Tripoli and its environs in the south and from Al-Biqa' in the east -- this also affects the situation in Lebanon, but as far as Israel is concerned it has no direct security impact.

[It is a] fact that it is impossible to physically liquidate all the terrorists, it seems to me that today no one would dispute this. The difference between their presence in Tripoli, Lebanon or in Jordan or in Syria beyond the Golan Heights or in another Arab country is not crucial. What counts and is crucial is their nonpresence in the area from which they could shell and threaten us. Therefore, Mr Speaker, the moment the terrorists were removed from the area adjacent to the border, it was essential that we make sure that they are not able to go back there. All the rest, although desirable to us, is not crucial and cannot justify the use of force.

The fact that the United States is also anxious to have these positive developments take place could perhaps enhance the chance that they would be achieved, but this cannot provide a justification or an impetus for us to achieve them by force. The use of Israel's outstanding military power must once again be limited exclusively to the guaranteeing of Israel's direct security, and there is broad national agreement on this.

The transgression in the Lebanese campaign should not turn into a new Israeli security doctrine. It is incumbent that we return to the security theory that has proved itself worthy ever since Israel was established; namely, that a military campaign is embarked upon only when we are attacked or are prevented from maintaining a vital national interest over which there is no argument, one which has no other solution unless a military move is employed. In the special geostrategic predicament in which Israel finds itself, other problems should not be solved by force or by the mobilization of the Israel Defense Forces.

The Arab countries, Knesset members, cannot be brought to the peace table by force. I, too, would not like to glide into the subject of this afternoon's debate and thus step on the toes of our colleagues who will talk about this. In his speech, the defense minister threatened and said a warning signal has been lit from Lebanon -- and I agree that certainly one should learn a lesson from the Lebanon affair to apply also to the establishment of a so-called Palestinian ministate in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza -- but we did not need the campaign in Lebanon to get this reminder. I am pleased that it is not only we who do not see the solution as coming in the form of the establishment of a Palestinian state, but also the United States today, too -- and this was said quite outright, and this should be welcome.

However, another warning signal was lit from the Lebanon affair, one which the defense minister naturally failed to mention. From the acquaintance we struck through this campaign with Lebanon, and with what we all call the Lebanese quagmire, there is yet another lesson to be learned, comrades: Let us not turn the State of Israel into a binational state, a country in which there are 3 million Jews versus 2 million Arabs in the opening stages. Let us observe a clear and distinct Jewish majority in Israel.

The fact that the Likud and its government were up in arms against the U.S. statement of its position, my friends, Knesset Members, is not surprising, because one of the things the U.S. president totally rejected in his statements is the Likud plan.

The U.S. statement totally rejects fostering the notion that says: Everything belongs to us. I would not like to spark a debate on this issue, as there will be an afternoon debate, but this, too, is another warning signal that was lit following the war in Lebanon.

Mr Speaker, only the proof that there is no chance of overcoming Israel on the battlefield, which is why the Arab countries have no other alternative but to reconcile themselves to Israel's existence, together with political efforts toward finding a compromise -- and I say so explicitly: toward finding a compromise -- that would satisfy the vital needs of all the parties, will advance peace in the Middle East. Thank you.

Begin Morning Address

TA081113 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0946 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Speech by Prime Minister Menahem Begin concluding the special Knesset debate on Operation Peace for Galilee -- live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, gentlemen, members of the Knesset: Operation Peace for Galilee is linked to four dates.. On 6 June -- following a decision by the Cabinet, the commander in chief of the army, on Saturday night, 5 June -- our soldiers set out to strike the terrorists who from Lebanese territory had been shedding our blood for 7 full years: for 4 years by infiltrations, by seizure of buildings, hostages, buses, the murder of men, women and children; during the past 3 years mainly by the bombardment of civilian settlements in the western and eastern Galilee -- day and night with certain pauses -- and their holding the inhabitants of the Galilee, some 200,000 people, hostage and imposing on them fear of sudden death nearly every day and night. On 6 June, the IDF left to destroy the terrorists' infrastructure, to push them north, and -- in accordance with the decision of the Cabinet -- to remove all the Galilee settlements from within range -- katyushas, 21.6 km; heavier guns with a 30-km range; 120-130 mm cannon with 27-km range; and even heavier 180-mm cannon with a 43-km range. On 10 June, I received a letter from the U.S. President containing an appeal to declare a cease-fire. We could not accede to this request by the honorable U.S. President because the enemy was still 18 km from Metulla. In other words, all of the Galilee Panhandle was within the terrorists' range of fire. And we continued fighting for another 24 hours, and our soldiers pushed the enemy beyond the 45-km line.

Then -- and this is the second date -- on 11 June, we unilaterally declared a cease-fire. Had the terrorists that same day accepted our declaration, as the Syrians did, suffering, bloodshed, victims, bereavement and orphans would have been prevented -- first of all among ourselves, but also among the civilian population and also among the terrorists. However, they did not take heed and they not only continued to shoot at our soldiers, they also announced that the war would go on. So we had no alternative but to push them northward, and the fighting continued....

[MK Tawfiq Tubi heckles] I do not believe everything you are saying.

[Begin] I do not ask you to believe.

[Deputy Knesset Speaker Me'ir Kohen] MK Tubi: very short interjections, not long ones.

[Begin] I am not paying any attention. The government's original decision was that our army would not attack the Syrians unless the Syrian Army attacked our forces. When the Syrian Army did attack our forces, the results of the battles were clear. We destroyed 405 Syrian tanks, including 9 T-72's, which are considered invulnerable by NATO; we downed 102 planes, including a Mig-25, the first time since this plane entered the skies; and we destroyed 21 SAM-6, SAM-8 and SAM-9 batteries -- lethal weapons, against which we did not yet have a suitable defense during the October war, and definitely not during the war of attrition.

Then came 23 June. This is the third date on which we said the following: We are offering to let the terrorists leave Beirut and Lebanon -- if they want to leave by land via the Beirut-Damascus highway through the section controlled by the IDF, we will enable them to leave. If they want an alternative way, by land or sea, we shall ensure it, but let them all leave -- from Beirut and Lebanon.

On 27 June, had they heeded our call, how much blood, suffering and how many victims would have been spared!

They did not want to take heed and they continued to fight, to resist and to shoot and thus the fighting went on for about 2 months more until the terrorists did listen to us and did submit to our demands and did leave Beirut, and yes, they also left Lebanon. During 2 months of fighting how many victims could have been spared had they heeded our words, our proposals.

The fourth date is 31 August-1 September. They all left and were scattered among eight or nine Arab countries. We shall remember these four dates and the attitude of the IDF, and of the government which commands it, toward human life.

Three achievements are tied to the Operation Peace for Galilee. First: peace for and in the Galilee, for all its settlements and inhabitants. I was in Nahariyya a week ago; I saw the inhabitants and the children -- there was laughter in their eyes, happiness in their hearts -- we have given them new life. No Knesset member can ignore this fact.

I have a proposal. Let two Knesset members from these benches go to Nahariyya or Qiryat Shemona. Let them set up a loudspeaker in the square.... [heckling by unidentified Knesset members] Just a minute, I have a very good proposal -- what are you smiling about there -- a generous proposal my friend. Let them set up a loudspeaker and announce that Operation Peace for Galilee was an unnecessary war; Operation Peace for Galilee was an injust war -- I promise you -- so you say....

[Heckling by Alignment members saying that they did not claim that the war was unnecessary, that they supported the operation as far as the 45-km north inside Lebanon]

[Begin] What is the matter? Doesn't Yosi Sarid say that? Doesn't he say that every day? [more heckling] Yes, definitely. How am I inciting? How am I inciting? I am not inciting anything. If you want to bother me, you shall not succeed. I promise them that the first....

[Deputy Knesset Speaker Me'ir Kohen] Knesset members, Mr Prime Minister, allow me to quiet the house, allow me just a minute.

[Begin] Yes, yes.

[Kohen] Knesset members! Knesset members! Knesset members! Knesset Member Rosolio, allow me to say a few words. Am I allowed to?

[Rosolio] We did not say the war was unnecessary.

[Kohen] Until now the discussion has been conducted....

[Heckling continues] [Kohen] Knesset members allow me to say a few words perhaps? I ask you...until now the discussion has been conducted....

[Heckling] [Kohen] Knesset members! Until now the discussion....

[Heckling] [Kohen] Knesset Member Gruper! Knesset members, until now the discussion has been conducted quietly. Let us hear....

[Heckling] [Kohen] Allow me! Everyone had permission to say what he wanted and he was not interrupted. I recall that MK Charlie Biton said harsh things and the Knesset speaker....

[Heckling] [Kohen] Excuse me! Every Knesset member is equal. The Knesset speaker did not allow him to be interrupted. I will certainly not allow the prime minister to be interrupted. With all due respect to each or you, I will not allow it.

It will not help. Knesset members! The prime minister is entitled to say what he wants. You can disagree with what he says. You are entitled to disagree. But it is his right to speak, and I shall defend him just as I shall defend every Knesset member. Knesset member Na'im: This is not heckling. This has exceeded and surpassed heckling. Exceeded and surpassed. I ask you to allow the prime minister to continue.

[Begin] I only wanted to say that the first people to approach those Knesset members would be local Alignment members and they would say to the Knesset members: Have mercy on our souls, be at it! Don't say such things! We shall lose our remaining influence here. Try it and you will hear that answer.

[Heckling] The first achievement is peace in the Galilee. Peace in the Galilee. New life for 200,000 people. There are no katyushas in Qiryat Shemona; there are no katyushas in Nahariyya; there are no katyushas in Kefar Gil'adi; there are no shells; the children go to school in the morning and return to their mothers and fathers in the afternoon; joy of life; new building; return to Qiryat Shemona, to all of the Galilee; the Galilee shall be built to splendor in our generation and time. This is the first achievement. Whoever wants to ignore it, let him climb up to the roof and shout: unnecessary and unjust war.

The second achievement, Mr Knesset Speaker, have brought a good deal of peace to the citizens of Israel. I do not claim that the attacks everywhere have already come to an end. That is impossible. This is an era of violence; it is sometimes impossible to understand.

Go throughout the world and see what is happening in London, in Paris, in Rome, in Palermo, in New York, in all the world. So it is possible that attacks will occur here and there. However, by having expelled the fighting ability of 25,000 terrorists supplied with modern arms, we have saved an indeterminate number of civilian lives. To a large extent, we have also guaranteed peace for Israel and its citizens.

Third, Mr Knesset Speaker, the IDF's deterrent force has truly been organized and renewed. At one time, its deterrent force had been put in question. But this question has vanished; it is no more. Its deterrent force appears great to the mob favoring aggression, the mobs favoring wars. It is great in the eyes of all the Arab countries and all their leaders hear this. Those are the three achievements of Operation Peace for Galilee.

Today, as we discuss the conclusion of the operation, we recognize the heavy price of peace. I wanted to say something from the heart. Woe to people who must make certain decisions day and night. But if there is no alternative and if the people and land of Israel must be defended, decisions will be made. And those who are in charge, shall stand firmly, willingly, strongly and patiently, and shall not take into consideration accusations -- in Israel or abroad -- nor miserable, base pictures, nor insulting and hurtful articles -- they will not take any of these into consideration. And they will carry out their task and fulfill their duty; their success will be great.

However, these decisions are bitter and painful; and we bow our heads before the bereaved families -- heroes of the nation no less than their children who sacrificed their lives -- and we honor them from the bottom of our hearts and we send wishes to the wounded that they recover quickly and completely.

Mr Knesset Speaker, I am concluding the wrap-up discussion of Operation Peace for Galilee. In this operation, we promised peace for the Galilee and all its inhabitants, and to a large extent to Israel and all of its inhabitants. We have strengthened the deterrent force. We have been victorious. Blessed are we that we have won this victory.

Shamir Address

TA081501 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1135 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Address by Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir to the Knesset at the opening of the second Knesset session of 8 September, devoted to President Reagan's new political plan for the Middle East — live]

[Text] [Intercepted by radio in progress] The U.S. President has addressed the U.S. nation, in which he presented the positions of the United States on the questions of the political arrangement that should apply to Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. The main principles of the U.S. position were delivered a day earlier to the prime minister by the U.S. ambassador to Israel. The Cabinet was summoned for a special session on Thursday, the 14th Elul, 2 September, and its resolution is submitted to the Knesset. The U.S. Government did not find it necessary to consult us on this new political plan, which pertains to our borders, our security and our positions. This is not done. It contradicts explicit commitments the U.S. administration undertook three times in the past: in the memorandum of understanding dated 20 December, 1973; and in the letter written by President Ford dated 1 September, 1975, which was reaffirmed in the memorandum of understanding dated 26 March, 1979. It says the United States will consult Israel in full and step by step, and will make every effort to coordinate its propsals with Israel. On the other hand, the U.S. administration finds it necessary and proper to consult with Arab countries which have more than once expressed their opposition to the Camp David accords. This marks a serious blow. What is worse, though, is the content of the new U.S. ideas which we will not be able to accept as the basis for negotiations on the peace arrangements in the region.

Mr Speaker, the Camp David accords were achieved following discussions and deliberations that were very sharp and difficult. Each word in those agreements [heskemim] is the outcome of fine debates, and any issue not included in them was deliberately omitted. The United States participated in the negotiations, influenced the parties' positions and mediated between them. The U.S. President at the time signed the documents as a witness. Throughout the course of the negotiations since that day, up to 1 September, 1982, the United States abstained from taking an explicit public stand on the essence of the subjects that were negotiable. The reason for this was clear and self-evident: The two parties to the agreement [heskem] knew full well that if the United States should take such a position, it would harm the negotiations and the chance for reaching an agreement [heskem] between the two parties.

The Camp David accords were a kind of package with a logical political connection between its components, even though there was no operational link between them. Israel agreed to make far-reaching concessions in the Sinai in return for peace with Egypt, knowing this is the end of the rope of the security and territorial chances it can take, because in regard to the eastern sector, agreement was reached [sukam] on an autonomous regime for Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District for an interim period of 5 years.

Even though in the negotiations Egypt demanded [tav'a] Arab sovereignty over Judaea, Samaria and Gaza, as well as a freeze on Jewish settlement activity, still its demand [drishata] was not accepted and Egypt accepted autonomy for 5 years. This entire constellation was shattered by the U.S. action, which overlooks the mutual link [ziqa] between the positions and the concessions that were taken, reopening demands [tvi'ot] and positions that were discussed and rejected in the course of the negotiations at Camp David. Therefore, the U.S. blow [pgi'a] is serious not only because of the contradictions it presents to distinct formulations in the text of the agreement, but because of the blow it deals to the entire conception and the internal political structure of the Camp David accords.

Upon reading the new U.S. proposals one could say that if the United States had at the time, back then at Camp David, insisted on the positions it published today, we would not have signed the Camp David accords. The Government of Israel gave very serious considerations to the U.S. proposals as they were submitted to the prime minister in the document, and decided to reject them and not to enter into any negotiations with any element on the basis of these positions.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan elaborated on these positions in his address to the U.S. nation, declaring Israel has the right to exist in peace behind secure and defensible borders, and it has a right to demand [litbo'a] that its neighbors recognize these facts. He even noted that the width of the State of Israel in the pre-1967 lines was less than 10 miles, and a large part of its population lived in the range of artillery belonging to hostile Arab armies. He announced that he has no intention of suggesting that Israel once again live under those conditions. President Reagan said further that only through a process of negotiations could the peoples of the Middle East reach a secure peace. He also declared that Jerusalem must remain undivided, even though its final status must be determined in negotiations. Finally, the President repeated his earlier declaration on the total U.S. commitment to Israel's security.

These are positive, significant statements, and we believe they express a sincere and deep feeling of commitment to and friendship for Israel, its security and future. However, it is our duty to point out with deep regret that the operational elements that accompanied the President's declarations as I have just quoted, contradict this and harm Israel and its security, the principle of negotiations and agreement [heskem] and the chances for peace between us and the rest of our Arab neighbors.

In the position paper submitted to us by the U.S. administration, it says full autonomy means granting real authority to the inhabitants to rule themselves, their land and its resources. The Camp David accords employed the same style, namely granting full autonomy to the inhabitants, and Israel has made it very clear in negotiations ever since that the reference is to autonomy in terms of population, not territory. The operational significance and importance of this point constituted a topic for negotiations with the United States, but now the United States has adopted a clear-cut position of its own which deviates from the language of the agreement [heskem] and severely hampers the negotiations. This position overturns everything that has been achieved on this subject by the representatives of Israel in difficult and prolonged negotiations. This is a change of the substance [mahutam] of the Camp David accords. We did not accept this position then and we will not accept it today.

The United States determines further that it would support the maintenance of economic, commercial, social and cultural ties between Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District and Jordan. The Camp David accords refer to the link of the autonomous region to Jordan and Israel in very cautious and calculated phraseology. In its new document, the United States found it proper to emphasize the link to Jordan, of all things, and overlook the existing ties -- which are there anyway -- with Israel, and thereby invite pressure toward a future severance from Israel. Open borders and free traffic are a fundamental principle which Israel has always supported, and which have -- to the best of our knowledge -- also thus far been acceptable to the United States. This is an inseparable part of Eretz Yisra'el, from which we will not separate either now or ever.

Jerusalem was not mentioned in the Camp David agreement itself because Israel did not accept any detriment [pgi'a] to the status of the unified capital of Israel, even though Egypt took issue with the Israeli position on this matter, and the positions of the parties can be seen in letters appended to the agreement. Now the United States comes and takes a totally opposite position to that of Israel. The effective implication of the participation of the Arabs of [east] Jerusalem in the elections to the autonomous body can be only one. The repartitioning of Jerusalem. We will never accept this.

The U.S. call for a freeze on the Jewish settlement drive in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District already in the interim stage is negative and harmful. It is no coincidence that this matter is not mentioned at all in the Camp David accords, because no Israeli Government that respects itself would have accepted having the right of Jews to settle in any part of Eretz Yisra'el to be a subject for discussion or even mentioned in any political document. The right of Jews to live in Eretz Yisra'el is fundamental, unshakable and needs no approval from any element. The very broaching of the issue is harmful. Worse, it would encourage Arab elements to believe they would be able to continue to strive toward the severence of parts of Eretz Yisra'el and their transfer to foreign ownership, empty of Jews. One cannot understand how this position can harmonize with the President's letter dated 31 August to the prime minister, saying -- and I quote that this position does not deviate from his deep conviction that the Jews have a longstanding right to live in peace in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza.

The security issue was discussed at length in Camp David and can be divided in two: Israel's overall defense in the face of an external attack; and the security of its inhabitants against terrorist attacks [hatqafot terror vehabala] from the Arab population of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. The key phrase on this matter in the framework agreement of Camp David stipulates that all steps and measures will be undertaken to guarantee Israel's security and that of its neighbors for the interim period and beyond. In order to grant this security, a strong police force will be established by the autonomy authority. This means that Israel's security against an external attack or terrorist attacks was given to Israel for the interim period and beyond. No Israeli representative in the negotiations ever conceived of a possibility that the prevention of terrorism and combat against terrorism could be handed over to a foreign element in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District.

The new U.S. position wishes to impose on the Arab inhabitants the responsibility for internal security; that is, beyond the spelled-out realm and jurisdiction of the police. This new definition is substantially different in essence from the position taken in the Camp David accords. It signifies not handing over responsibility for all affairs of internal security to the autonomy council. Its real implication is that the responsibility for the war against terrorism will not be in our hands. No Israeli in his right mind would accept this position.

[Answering indistinct heckling from the benches] No one is sure of this. It will have it, but I must fight it, and the responsibility for war against it should lie with us, not with foreigners. Look, you would actually agree with me if only you looked more deeply into it. Then you would agree with this position.

Let me devote a couple of words to the meaning of Security Council Resolution 242 and the link between it and the Camp David accords. All through the Camp David documents, and later in the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, Resolution 242 takes a central place as a preamble to treaties and documents. The participants at Camp David agreed that the negotiations were intended, among other things, to implement the clauses of the resolution through a peace treaty between Israel and its neighbors. In so doing, the parties granted a detailed interpretation to the resolution and implemented, it de facto. Now the United States has reopened this subject, as though Camp David never existed, and as though there is no connection between 242 and the Camp David accords. The autonomy applies to the resolution, Resolution 242, but the new U.S. interpretation is not satisfied with this alone, but instead comes to demand [litbo'a] explicitly that Israel withdraw along that front, too.

When one joins the positions of the United States on this matter and all their components -- namely the principle of withdrawal from Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District; the principle of territories in return for peace; the relative link between the depth of the withdral to the extent of peace that would be given in return for it; the freeze on settlement activity; the opposition to Israeli sovereignty over the territories of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza in the future; and the granting of the right to the Arabs of Jerusalem to participate in the election to the autonomy authority -- then the real significance of this combination is the return of Israel to the strangling borders of 1967.

Let us add to this the denial of Israel's sovereignty or any future option, as well as the ambiguous language employed with regard to the possibility of establishing a Palestinian state. Then the resulting scenario that derives from a possible implementation of these positions is very clear and very gloomy. The Camp David accords are bereft of their content; everything that was proposed in Camp David by the Arab side and was rejected by Israel once again appears in the form of a Presidential position coming from above to bend Israel over and subdue it.

Mr Speaker, the Government of Israel could not but reject these positions, even if they came upon us from a friendly President of the most friendly country, and Israel's ally — the United States. Our relations with the United States have a special character and there is a deep friendship between our two nations, founded on joint values and identical interests. Still, from time to time differences arise between our two countries, pertaining in particular to our borders and the ways to defend our security. These differences of opinion are natural and stem from different circumstances. They express our independence, special ways, and our unique needs. A true alliance can only exist between sovereign peoples, each of them cognizant of what sets them apart and what binds them together. Israel is a difficult ally, but a loyal one and a credible one. We are convinced that what we share with the United States has an element of permanence and depth, whereas what is disputed is temporary and transient. The permanent will overcome the transistory.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel have experienced many changes, ups and downs in our relations with the United States. The people know, and know, that on basic matters that pertain to our existence -- such as security, Jerusalem, the 1967 borders, the danger involved in a Palestinian state -- we have no alternative but to stand our ground firmly, courageously and clearly against even our great friend, the United States. No differences of opinion, different schools or parties can justify taking a position different from the one decided upon by the Government of Israel. The people of Israel will stand united, and we shall overcome.

Hilel Address

TA081914 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1159 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Speech in the second special Knesset debate on the Reagan plan by Alignment MK Shlomo Hilel on 8 September — live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, honorable Knesset members: I have read that Prime Minister Begin, when he heard of President Reagan's plan, bitterly said that we gave the United States a free Lebanon and the United States wants to take away Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip from us. These remarks not only contain an expression of opposition to Reagan's plan, or to some parts of this plan, but also contain an expression of deep disappointment by a person who was treated in an ungrateful manner or, as the prophet put it: Presidents have I reared and brough up, but they have disappointed me. [Pun on prophet Isaiah's words in Chapter 1, Verse 2]

Mr Speaker, with your permission, I will make an incidental remark: I am not at all happy about this style of speech and way of acting we have lately demonstrated. On one occasion, Begin contributed the mopped-up Beaufort Castle to Major Haddad, while now he is giving the free Lebanon to the Americans. This is megalomania [last word in English] which disappeared from the world with absolute monarchism, and these terms must no longer be used.

Mr Speaker, Mr Begin's indignation implies what any child could understand anyway, that his main expectation from the war in Lebanon, at least from the part that goes beyond guaranteeing peace in the Galilee, was to have a free hand in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza and receive a blessing for this path, perhaps also a pat on the back and a wink from the U.S. President.

What we are faced with instead are illusions which do not hold water or expectations. Mr Begin has indeed good reason to feel deeply disappointed since this is not the first time he has made a far-reaching dramatic move, as well as sacrificed many victims with the hope of gaining the go-ahead signal and a free hand regarding the solution of all aspects of the Palestinian issue.

This happened at Camp David, when the big concession was made in the Sinai of all places, including the military airfields, Sharm ash-Shaykh, the Rafah approaches and Yamit. The expectation was that due to this, everyone would praise the Begin-conceived autonomy, the autonomy that Begin views as a phase prior to annexing the territories for all eternity.

The prime minister gained much praise then from great people then — presidents, counts and noblemen -- and even received half of the Nobel Peace Prize, but his interpretation of the autonomy was not accepted by any of his fellow participants, neither the Americans, the Egyptians, nor any world figure. The autonomy plan remained in deep crisis.

Then the Lebanon war occurred and the expectations of the prime minister again rose. He was convinced he would be told: You did a great job, with all due respect, leave Judaea, Samaria and Gaza in your hands; keep the change. [last three words in English] Out of enthusiasm, Tehiya, too, rushed to join this Cabinet which they had fought and slandered earlier, since it seemed to them that the war in Lebanon grants Israel, Judaea, Samaria and Gaza as a ripe fruit, and that the entire matter now boils down to adding settlements of Gush Emunim and seizing the Hadassah building in Hebron.

The following is the U.S. President's reply: Congratulations on your successes, but your plans for autonomy are not at all acceptable. This is true irony, honorable Knesset members. In the latter, in which the U.S. President congratulates Mr Begin on ending the war in Lebanon, he tells him he is going to declare his new plan which totally ignores Mr Begin's conception of the autonomy:

My dear Menahem -- so he opens the letter -- forget about the autonomy -- so he concludes his letter.

This Israeli Government was left with an idea which remained like an unturned stone, and must ask itself what else can be done. Or, as the prophet put it: What more was there to do for my vineyard that I had not done? When I looked for it to yield grapes, why did it yield wild grapes? [Isaiah, Chapter 5, Verse 4] It is we who eat the wild grapes. What can we do? We have nothing else to return after all, nothing else to conquer -- or so at least I hope -- and nothing more to give the Americans. Here we should tell the government very simply that it is about time to think reasonably, to think and not only to strike.

Faced with the shattered illusions, the prime minister said that for him it was a black or hard day. I do not remember exactly which word he used. We have indeed reached a moment of truth and it seems that the truth is bitter and somber. We finished returning the Sinai, ended the heavy and multivictim war in Lebanon, and have no acceptable political plan. The government has no political path.

Out of deep frustration, most honorable members of the government rose to make a nice claim: The Alignment is to blame for everything. After all, President Reagan has accepted the basic points of the Alignment's plan: The Alignment talks of a solution to the problem within the framework of a Jordanian-Palestinian state and so does President Reagan; the Alignment talks of safe borders and readiness for territorial compromise as well as against the corption of 1.25 million Arabs within the State of Israel, and so does Presidnet Reagan. The Alignment's chairman, MK Shim'on Peres, apparently whispered this plan into Mr Reagan's left ear and thus the plan was born.

All this has been accompanied by slanders and distortions to the point where there is ridicule of and concern for the real face of Israeli democracy. This is the expression of gratitude for the information efforts made by the Alignment, side by side with the government, beginning with the rejection of the Fahd plan and ending with the defense of Israel's launching a defensive war in Lebanon. MK Shim'on Peres fiercely struggled in meetings with European leaders and with Socialist International members.

I, too, your loyal servant, found myself in a campaign together with other Knesset members in the European Council. What do you think we said? That we gave up the principle of defensible borders and territorial compromise which was the declared policy of all Israeli governments up to 1977, and which has been the declared position of the party up to now? Do you think that we suddenly said we found the light inherent in the Likud's program of annexing the territories, together with the 1.25 million Palestinians who do not want us, and convert the State of Israel from a prosperous and developing Jewish state into a binational, torn and divided state? How much disdain and mockery you accorded the Alignment's plan for compromise and safe borders!

The prime minister and his colleagues used to claim that there was nobody who supports the Alignment's plan and there is nobody with whom we can discuss it. Now, we are suddenly faced with your hysterical reaction. This proves there is somebody to talk to. Otherwise, this hysterical reaction cannot be understood. There is a hysterical reaction since it transpires that President Reagan -- andperhaps also the Jordanians -- prepared to examine such ideas. President Reagan has indeed adopted...[Heckling by Likud MK Roni Mild]

I would like to tell you, MK Milo, that compared to the Israeli Government, all the decisions by the Fes conference seem much more responsible, much more calculated, much more moderate. President Reagan has indeed adopted the territorial compromise idea in quite a clear manner. He said in his speech -- I am quoting remarks made by the President in his speech -- that in the course of the anticipated negotiations the United States will support positions that seem to us fair and reasonable and that may promote sound negotiations.

It is almost certain, Knesset members, that what seems to us reasonable and fair will not, by the nature of things, be acceptable to the U.S. President. However, the principle exists. Let us seize it and develop it. The principle of territorial compromise, which until now have claimed no one is willing to accept, exists. And now you have gone into hysterics because it appears to you that there is someone willing to listen to this idea.

However, as for the very raising of the Reagan plan, with all its negative points, this right is reserved for Mr Begin in person and he is not to be dispossessed of it. It is not to be taken away from him, and Reagan speaks about this explicitly in his speech. And I again quote his speech: The successful completion of Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai and the courage shown on this occasion by Prime Minister Begin and President Mubarak in living up to their agreements convinced me the time had come for a new American policy.

Begin's courageousness and Sharon's skill in bringing to a successful conclusion the withdrawal and the evacuation of blossoming settlements in the Sinai encouraged the U.S. President to think that they are indeed now prepared for new missions. And I do not know why one had to be so surprised and astonished, since every child knew that the Americans were avoiding angering the Israeli Government before the completion of the Sinai evacuation. However, immediately afterwards they did everything to break the deadlock which had beset the autonomy negotiations, and Reagan said so clearly at the beginning of his speech, which I shall not again quote.

Knesset members, the one who has wasted more than 3 years on the autonomy subject -- and my friend Dr Yosef Burg has done so with unseemly failure -- should not be astonished at being surprised by unexpected moves.

Minister Burg thought about this, that his appointment as the one responsible for the autonomy negotiations is like his post in the government -- a life-long post, a life-long job. [last three words in English] He did not understand that after the completion of the Sinai withdrawal, things would change completely and that he would be left far from everything.

Mr Speaker, one way or another, Reagan's plan was born. But the question is: What should our attitude to it be? I heard that at one point the prime minister claimed that this plan is worse than the Rogers plan of December 1969. I am not sure that this is so. However, it is correct that we are now in a worse position than we were in 1969 in terms of the debate over the plan or parts of it. There is no doubt in the world that the Camp David accords, the matter of autonomy, and especially the completion of the withdrawal from the Sinai, have made the Palestinian issue a central subject that can no longer be shunted into the corner.

For truth's sake, Knesset members, the disadvantages and dangers of Reagan's plan -- and they are found in the speech he made -- sprouted from the loopholes and ambiguities of the autonomy plan. And who better than the foreign minister knows these flaws in the autonomy plan in the Camp David accords? The prime minister's efforts today to plug these loopholes after the completion of the Sinai withdrawal have become a pointless academic matter. The loopholes should have been plugged before the withdrawal; in fact, even before the commitment to withdraw. And what was not stopped before the withdrawal cannot be amended now, after the withdrawal.

Another element exacerbating matters is the war in Lebanon, which sharpened the interest of world opinion in the fate of the Palestinian refugees. How did you fail to understand, our colleagues in the government, that these pictures of tens of thousands of Palestinian refugees who have again become refugees would focus world opinion on the Palestinian issue and spur a search after [the war] for a quick solution to the entire Palestinian problem? Moreover, our situation today is more difficult than it was when the Rogers plan was proposed in 1969 because here a Presidential plan is involved with all of the President's prestige. President Nixon did not stick his neck out and give his name to Rogers' plan. There is a special political significance.

[Heckling; Hilel continues] There is a special significance to the fact that the President today has put all of his prestige behind this plan, and our problem is indeed greater, Mr Prime Minister. And you know this; no one should recognize this better than you. We have a difficult problem.

[Heckling; Hilel continues] Wait! Relax! You are so wound up because you do not trust yourself. Listen a bit. And last but not least, gentlemen...

[Deputy Knesset Speaker Me'ir Kohen] Knesset members!

[Hilel] Last but not least -- I ask you not to interrupt my colleagues from the Alignment; at least do not interrupt me. Last but not least, nor pleasant with respect ot the seriousness of our situation today: We are in a struggle -- and we also have to struggle with this plan -- in a situation in which neither the U.S. Senate nor the entire U.S. House of Representatives today supports the State of Israel as in the past. Never have we been in such an abject situation in terms of our standing with the U.S. House of Representatives, upon which we could rely more than once in the past, even when it was necessary to conduct a debate with the administration.

And in the face of this hard and grim reality into which we have fallen by chance, and to which I will say the government contributed so as not to say that it caused it, in the Camp David accords and the war in Lebanon, and in the distancing of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from their historical and consistent support for Israel -- sometimes even against the administration -- the government is hurrying to slam the door in the face of President Reagan's proposal, who remains among the few righteous persons in our generation in his support for Israel.

Where is the wisdom? Where is the political responsibility? Do you know what -- at the very least where is the minimal bit of sophistication? By your own words you have caused the Arab summit in Fes to appear as more balanced, more intelligent, more responsible -- and forgive me for the expression -- more sophisticated than the Israeli Government.

It is true that Reagan did not adopt the government's conception that is based on two absurdities. The first absurdity: the thought that it is possible to grant autonomy, but not to the territory in which the people live. And the second absurdity: that it is possible to annex the territories without annexing their inhabitants.

These are two unrealistic principles upon which the government is trying to base a political plan that has no chance in the future. This is an absolutely absurd idea. However, in addition to this, not only is it unrealistic, it is also undesirable. About this government's plan and thought, it may be said that it would be bad if it were accepted and it would be bad if it were to smash against the rock of reality. If the government's plan were to be accepted, this would mean that Israel would progress by giant strides toward being a binational state, and in the course of time -- even worse - it would cease being a Zionist state in its essence and a Jewish state in its character. And it will not help you, Knesset Member Shapira, whether or not they fly on El Al. It would cease to be a Jewish state. And of all the dangers facing Israel and the people of Israel, there is no danger greater and worse than the joining of 1.25 million Palestinians who do not want us.

However, in the path you tread, when it becomes clear to you also that our situation is hopeless -- what is the perspective, members of the coalition: a continuation of the wars, more wars, stark isolation, being cut off from the last of our friends in the world? The Reagan plan, or Reagan's principles as they were expressed, are far from responding to our needs and far from firing the imagination. And there is ... [heckling]

[Hilil continues] Sir, I thank you for the correction; I accept this correction willingly. Good. Good. All that I said was that Reagan -- I say this for protocol -- I meant Reagan. [The Knesset members apparently are disputing the pronunciation of Reagan's name] Gentlemen, the criticism we have of Reagan's plan must be expressed clearly.

The approach to the subject of Jerusalem is unacceptable to us. It is nice that President Reagan accepts the integrity of Jerusalem, but we cannot hold any negotiations or debate over Jerusalem's status as part of Israel and as its capital. We must make this very clear at the beginning and not, Mr Prime Minister, leave ambiguities in this matter, as happened at Camp David, where, it is true, Mr Begin sent a letter to Carter saying Israeli law and jurisdiction had been extended to Jerusalem. But there was also a letter from President as-Sadat stating his position on Jerusalem. Then the government reconciled itself to this ambiguity, although it could have insisted on this before its agreement to withdraw from all of the Sinai. By giving in then, it has created a difficult problem as to the status of Jerusalem in the eyes of the world and in the continuation of the negotiations.

This mistake must not be repeated today, and it must be said clearly and unambiguously and in good time that we shall not negotiate the fate of Jerusalem. [heckling]

On the matter of Jerusalem, I have stated my position. If you are capable of listening until I finish...[heckling]

Knesset Member Milo, your problem is a lack of sophistication. I have already said there is no greater proof of your lack of sophistication than your questions, because you are incapable of understanding either nuances or sophistication. For and against, for and against -- I have heard your positions. [heckling]

There are additional points in Reagan's principles, and I shall yet deal with them, but there are also principles that we should accept, encourage and strengthen. With wisdom we can strengthen these positive principles. With lack of wisdom and lack of sophistication, we shall abandon the field to the negative influence of hostile elements. This is the question: Should Israel be interested and can it allow itself to slam the door and renounce positions of negotiations and persuasion, or should it make every effort to jeopardize its standing and its positions?

I want to say unequivocally that if I thought the Reagan plan were a dictate I would not accept it. If I though this was the end product of the negotiations, I would vote against it, as I voted against the bad Camp David plan.

But why is it forbidden to see in the Reagan plan an opening -- at least an opening -- for negotiations with the Americans, and perhaps also with the Jordanians? Reagan's principles contain opposition to the establishment of another Palestinian state. There is opposition to the principle of self-determination, whose significance to us is indeed the establishment of a Palestinian state. Reagan speaks clearly about readiness to compromise, and even makes a declaration never before made by an incumbent president or prime minister. Sometimes presidents say things when they are not in office.

The President said, and I am quoting: I have personally followed Israel's heroic struggle for survival and have supported it since the State of Israel was established 34 years ago. In the pre-1967 borders, the width of Israel's territory at the narrowest point was hardly 10 miles; the majority of the Israeli population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab states. I do not mean to ask Israel to again live in this manner. There is no precedent for such a declaration by an incumbent president, and only by virtue of such a declaration, by virtue of these statements, should be government have acted intelligently and responsibly and not reacted with a flat rejection.

My friends, the Knesset members, as a person who has worked in the Foreign Ministry and the United Nations for many years, I am pessimistic enough to see that there is no certainty that this is the only way to inerpret President Reagan's remarks. However, why should we not seize this and try to expand, deepen and nail things down. Why this lack of sophistication?

I said, and I am stressing again, that there are principles that are unacceptable to us in the Reagan proposals. The Labor Party [Political] Bureau, which discussed this plan on 2 September, listed a whole series of elements that are unacceptable, and should be canceled or changed. The first issue that appears in the decisions by the Labor Party Bureau is, and here I am quoting: insistence on Israel's right to settle in the security zones. We did not compromise in the past, nor will we compromise now, our right to strengthen our position and power in security areas. For us, Knesset members, settlement is a political, moral and security matter. Reagan's demand [tevi'ato] was the ending of all settlements, at least for the period of the negotiations, and this is unacceptable to us. This is unacceptable to us in principle.

However, this is not the argument between us. The argument between us is not actually over the Reagan plan, but over the government's plan, since we want to invest our best efforts to remaining in the security areas along the Jordan, in the northwest part of the Dead Sea, the Jerusalem environs and expanding along the green line.

Let us concentrate on the main point. What are you afraid of, Cabinet members and coalition members? Do you fear these demands [derishot] will not be accepted? I think you are afriad this position will indeed by accepted; hence, the hysterical reactions.

The prime minister is trying to terrorize us, saying that after the territorial compromise with Jordan, King Husayn will get Yasir 'Arafat to rule the divided and demilitarized West Bank, and then a Palestinian state will be set up through the back door. The absurdity inherent in this threat not only stands out but also proves that Mr Begin knows that there indeed are chances for territorial compromise. Otherwise, why the great anger? His opposition to territorial compromise is not a result of his idea that this is unrealistic but of the fear that it will be accepted. Hence the prime minister's threat that this will end in 'Arafat's taking the reign and reins from Husayn.

Sirs, today of all days, in this month of September that should remind many of the Black September, to speak of this scenario of King Husayn granting 'Arafat a high status -- it seems to me this picture is not so realistic. [heckling by unidentified Knesset members]

I would like to tell you: There are stories of people kissed in our history which I would not like to repeat here; all sorts of people kissed one another. [as heard]

I would like to tell you that exactly on this matter of the PLO, I can say that everything done by Ari'el Sharon today in southeran Lebanon and in Beirut is child's play compared with what King Husayn did to the PLO and this, too, is recorded in history. Moreover, where will we be located? We will be located along the Jordan; we will be located along secure borders. Why are there attempts to terrorize us, unless you know deep down in your heart there is indeed a chance that the proposal of territorial compromise and safe borders can exist?

In conclusion, Mr Speaker, I would like to say that the Israeli people are now most sharply and clearly faced with the historic choice which has always accompanied and confronted the Zionist movement: A. On the one hand, realistic Zionism, which combines realism and vision, knows to focus on the main issues to guarantee the best achievements for Israel. This is how the state was founded, when the argument between readiness for territorial compromise and the acceptance of the partition proposal was decided. If the argument had not been decided, the state would not have existed since we too would have opposed the foundation of the state and nothing would have existed.

B. Throughout the history of Zionism there always has been a declarative [last word in English], so-called maximalist Zionism which slammed the door and answered in the negative to any idea of compromise based on reality. The State of Israel emerged thanks to the wisdom shown by the people by not being swept by sterile Zionism but adhering to reason, responsibility and anxiety about the fate of the people.

In recent years, too, we saw the malignant outcomes of the all-or-nothing policy. Those who opposed Resolution 242 and left the government due to it -- Prime Minister Begin then was a minister who left the Cabinet -- and due to readiness in principle to compromise, will end up returning everything.

Knesset members, an all-or-nothing policy more often than not ends with nothing, rather than the acceptance of all. The government's position today stems from an unreadiness to consider the idea of compromise, as if we could have everything.

This path of the government leads us into danger. The intransigence of the government and its opposition to examine -- at least to examine -- the possibility of compromise based on reason, is bound to lead us to a dead end: The results of which will be war and a totally isolated Israel.

Even if that were possible, Israel has no interest in becoming a binational nation by annexation. I am confident though that this will not be possible either.

Moreover, since we saw the path of this government in Camp David, I, regretfully, cannot get rid of the fear that this may be an end of season sale and we will find ourselves with a big nothing. In contrast with this path of the government which led us to a dead end, the Alignment proposes that we focus on the most important things -- guaranteeing safe borders and the integrity of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, guaranteeing the matter of water, which is so vital to the thirsty State of Israel -- and not get entangled with annexation which will damage Zionism and the Jewish character of Israel. I do not believe this government can change its path and therefore this government has to go. Thank you.

Begin Announcement on Missiles

TA081611 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1600 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The IDF spokesman has announced: Air force planes attacked and destroyed a SAM-9 launching vehicle this afternoon in the vicinity of Dahr al-Baydar, 10 km north of Bhamdun. All our aircraft are safe. This was what the IDF spokesman announced, and the prime minister reported this to the Knesset at the beginning of his address:

[Begin Begin recording] Mr Speaker, allow me to inform the house of a report I received a few minutes ago: An attack on surface-to-air missiles in Lebanon has been completed, and our aircraft destroyed a Syrian surface-to-air missile battery inside Lebanon. I would like to use this opportunity to once again warn the Government of Syria that we will not tolerate the introduction of surface-to-air missiles in Lebanon. Each such battery that is introduced will be destroyed. [end recording]

These were the prime minister's remarks at the opening of his remarks at the Knesset.

Further Begin Remarks

According to recorded remarks carried by Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew at 1705 GMT on 8 September Begin went on to say: "I hope this announcement will be heard in Damascus with all earnestness. We do not want any fighting with the Syrian Army. A certain situation exists: The Syrian Army is going to leave Lebanon anyway. We too will leave Lebanon. Lebanon will become an independent, free country, with territorial integrity. However, until this happens, under no circumstances will we tolerate surface-to-air missiles on Lebanese soil."

Begin Summing-Up Address

TA081719 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1525 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Prime Minister Menahem Begin's concluding address to the Knesset 8 September session on President Reagan's proposed peace plan for the Middle East -- live]

[Text] [Intercepted in progress by the radio] Now, Mr Speaker, upon coming to sum up this interesting debate, I want to ask: Why is it that since 1 September, since bits and pieces of information on the new U.S. administration reports were leaked, has there been glee in the Alignment, frenzy in the opposition's domain? Why are cheers to be heard among our friends and comrades in the Labor Party and MAPAM? Apparently they ought to have been worried, not, God forbid, broken, not destroyed and shattered, but they should have felt simple, natural human national concern. Why? Because they wished to inform me, the prime minister of Israel, on behalf of the President -- and I emphasize that it was not the President himself who reported this to me, but a message was relayed to me on behalf of the President -- that, and I quote: There will be participation of the Palestinian inhabitants of east Jerusalem in the elections to the authority of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza.

Alignment members of both components, I want to know if both parts of this party accept this arrangement [hesder]. After all, anyone in his right mind would understand that this means the repartitioning of Jerusalem. There is, and will be -- as we still want to believe -- a self-governing authority [last three words in English preceded by Hebrew version of the term] an administrative council of the autonomy for the Arab inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. All of a sudden I am informed on behalf of the President that the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem and its eastern part -- that is the way it reads: east Jerusalem [last two words in English] -- should be given permission to vote for that autonomy institution. It follows that the authority of the administrative council will apply to part of the city and its inhabitants, whereas the other part will be under the authority of the State of Israel, of which Jerusalem is the capital. This is the division of Israel. Is this good tidings? Should it lead to joy or even to rejoicing in your adversary's fall? I think such an announcement should be received with no fear, without one's knees shaking, and not "woe is me," but with concern, until this statement is eliminated automatically and the danger passes. I assume that all the Alignment members, being patriotic and lovers of Zion and Jerusalem like myself -- not more or less -- think this is not a good suggestion, a negative one, one that should be fought against and opposed and removed from the agenda.

So, then, what is the source of this rejoicing? I read on: security -- a developing and growing Palestinian responsibility for internal security, based on ability and performance. What does the Camp David agreement stipulate on security? Let me read the quotation as it was taken down. There will be a withdrawal of the Israeli Armed Forces, whereas the remaining Israeli forces -- the remaining Israeli forces [last four words in English] -- will be redeployed in security zones that will be specified. The agreement will likewise include arrangements [hesderim] for guaranteeing internal and external security and public order.

As all of you can see, ladies and gentlemen, the Camp David accords make no distinction -- not to mention differentation -- between internal security and external security. They are one. Now there comes the suggestion, based on the position of the U.S. administration as submitted to me, that there will be Palestinian responsibility for domestic security. Palestinian. This is not a good piece of information, as all would agree. If it is good, I say, but it is not a good piece of information. You ask why? It is true that we dealt an enormous blow to the murderers and terrorist organization called the PLO, leaving 25,000 without the power to fight, disarming them of equipment worth billions of dollars, scattering them among the seven seas. Naturally, they shoot in the air, rejoice and kiss kings and princes -- but this is nothing but comedy, and everyone knows this. After all, this is the blow the like of which has never been, ever, since a terrorist organization emerged in the form of a semiregular army.

So it is true we struck them that way, but did we ever deny there is PLO, say in Judaea or in Samaria or, let us even say in other places throughout Eretz Yisra'el? No, they are there. Do you know why? First of all there are Arab people who can be convinced it is necessary to join the PLO. I absolutely do not deny such a possibility exists. In addition to this, I once held a conversation with Secretary of State Haig and I got a report from our sources that Saudi Arabia gave the PLO $400 million, and I told him about it. He denied this and said billions, Mr Prime Minister, billions. [quotation in English] They receive billions from the Saudis. Well, then, if there is a terrorist organization that receives hundreds of millions or billions of dollars, no doubt it can sustain a terrorist, place a Kalashnikov in his hands, transfer to him a few kilograms of explosives, and more. I know, if my peers in the opposition will forgive me, from a primary source, as a result of daily communication. I know what the security services are doing so that those explosives and Kalashinikovs and cannons are not used against Jews. This is a daily scene. So, for 4 full years -- after all, 17 September will be the 4th anniversary of the signing of the Camp David agreements -- we have argued and claimed to the United States and Egypt in every conversation and in each meeting that we will be in charge of security. The Government of Israel will be responsible for security in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, internal and external alike; there is no distinction. This is something over which an argument has been going on.

Now the person who formulated these proposals in the name of the U.S. President has come and said: Nothing of the sort. Internal security will be separate from external security and will be entrusted to the Palestinians. I presume the reference is to the administrative council or to a branch of it. This would be a fundamental change in our predicament if it were applied, and our lives would be a free-for-all. Anyone with any sense would understand this. Every day and night there would be an assassination attempt against a Jew or an Arab. Only a week ago, that terrorist organization murdered an Arab from the area village league. What was his sin? What crime did he commit? Even here there are people who call these people quislings. Shame, it is a disgrace to hear such a thing, Is there a Nazi administration here in Israel to establish quislings for it? These are loyal Arabs, Arab patriots, and I respect them. They are prepared to work with a Jew rather than kill him. What is their sin? What crime did they commit? So that man was killed just a few days ago. Of course, [interrupted by indistinct interjection by MK Tawfiq Tubi]

MK Tubi, you know and have heard it many times from me that in this house there is no one who respects the Arab people more than I. There are people who respect those people as much as I, but not more than I. I respect the Arab people for their contribution to human culture -- and it is a great contribution -- but this is not to say it is impossible to both respect the Arab people and at the same time agree that Eretz Yisra'el belongs to the Jewish people. This is a very simple, historic division. The Arab people have 22 countries and the Jewish people have one, and it is called Eretz Yisra'el. Listen, you at the time shouted: Hurray for Stalin. Today you are shouting: Hurray for Reagan? I wish you health.

Well, then, I repeat: This, after all, is a matter of life or death for us. If security is not left in our hands -- as we have maintained for 4 years, and as we argued at Camp David and continue to claim in every tripartite or bilateral meeting -- our lives will be jeopardized, with bloodshed and murder being a daily thing. Consequently, you should have been concerned, and truly not look with fear or worry or with a broken heart, but with a certain degree of human concern. So where does all this rejoicing and cheering come from and after all?

Third, I was asked on behalf of the President to completely freeze the settlement activity in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. In English: real freeze of settlements. [last four words in English] These are the original English words. Is this cause for happiness? I know we differ, and this could be a source of consolation: I have never heard the Alignment oppose settlement per se. On the contrary, I remember the consultations with Yisra'el Galili. I remember the deliberations in the Settlement Committee headed by...[interupted by indistinct interjection].

You agree with me, so why are you interrupting me? I am not only talking about Kefar Vitkin, I am also talking about the Jordan Rift Valley. We agree, after all, so you are in favor of settlement [hitnahalut] in certain places. You have a theory, which to me seems very strange, a type of Zionism that Jews must not be allowed to settle in those areas of Eretz Yisra'el which are densely populated by Arab inhabitants. I have never heard, and after all I am already old and will very soon be 70. I have been a Zionist since the age of 10, so during my 60 years as a Zionist I have never heard that Zionists did not settle in areas densely-populated by Arabs. I remember the settlement in the Yizre'el Valley, inside a densely-populated Arab area; I recall the establishment of Tel Aviv inside a densely-populated... [interrupted by indistinct interjection by MK Shulamit Aloni]

Mrs Shulamit Aloni, I would ask you to sit down and to refrain from shouting. Each time you shout...Mrs Aloni....

Well, then, I cannot recall when, at any point in time, Zionists decided not to settle in densely-populated Arab areas. I think this is how Eretz Yisra'el was built, or else it would not have been established. [Interrupted by indistinct interjection by MK Shulamit Aloni]

Did you change places with him only to shout? Why are you so hysterical, moving around, back and forth? [laughter] Are you losing your temper? If you want to smoke a cigarette, why don't you leave and have one? What a blabberer, I have never seen such a woman.

In brief, I repeat once again, this -- not in any other way -- is how Eretz Yisra'el was built. You say in the last 100 years? All right, have it your way: 100 years. We went everywhere. There were Jews in Gaza, in Nabulus. When were there no Jews in Eretz Yisra'el? Yet I was required [nidrashti] to effect a real freeze of the settlement. No settlement. This is no doubt something that causes worry. Are we strangers to Judaea and Samaria? Did we come to a certain place deliberately and begin settling there?

God Almighty, after all, our nation was born in Judaea and Samaria! There are boors and there are satirical pieces making fun of history, but I would like to read some things to you -- and soon I will tell you who wrote them -- on the value of history in the annals of a nation. For example, what are the phenomena from which our movement was nourished? What is the source of our love of our homeland? Have we stuck to real assets we possessed? Did we have strips of land we were familiar with or a scenery in which we lived? Our patriotism grew out of the book. It adhered to verses, to historic names. It was an abstract love of the homeland, which we bore within ourselves throughout the generations, carrying it with us everywhere.

This abstract patriotism has turned into a tremendously dynamic force. I ask: Who was the author of these statements? Who? Berl Katzenelson. So, do you see what history is? What the abstract things are? [Addressing MK Charlie Biton] What? Have you read Berl Katzenelson's writings once in your life? Charlie, have you even once in your life read Berl Katzenelson that you are interfering in such an argument? Have you heard how Berl Katzenelson valued history?

So I say: There have been some satirical pieces written belittling historic values, reminiscences. We are no satirists. We are serious people. This is how we built, fought, sacrificed and made progress. This is how all of us together got as far as we have, in the various camps we were grouped in, each one in his own right and in his own way. Well, then, now we are told: Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District -- no Jew will ever settle there again. It is forbidden. A real freeze [last three words in English]. A freeze, a total, real freeze. [addressing MK Yiga'el Hurvitz's indistinct interjection] Yiga'el my friend, Yiga'el, why are you interrupting me? [indistinct interjection by MK Ra'anan Na'im]

Well then, this is the position, that there should be a real, total freeze on settlement, that not a single additional Jew is to arrive in Elqana, that no Jewish settlement is to be added to the 102 which have, thank God, been set up in the last 5 years in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip. Total freeze is spoken of. Is this good tidings for you then, for the Alignment? You do want to settle, after all, sometimes on the Golan Heights, sometimes in the Jordan Valley and sometimes -- do tell the truth, between the two of us and let it be secret -- somewhere near the mountain [not further identified], not totally on the mountain but near the mountain, to set up a settlement there. [heckling followed by the Knesset speaker's call for order]

What sort of parliamentarism is this? Everyone talks freely and it is only the prime minister who is not given the right to speak, is it not so? This is your democracy, what you would like it to be, but it will not be.

There was soom room for concern as to what should be done; for one thing, we should stand together and fend off the attack so as to make it clear that we will continue with the settlements, for one. You will speak of settlement in the Jordan Valley while we will say on the mountain ridge. Perhaps we can cooperate.

We will aid you in the Jordan Valley and you together with us will get on the mountain ridge and everything will be good. What ground is there for joy and merriment.

Fourth, the definition of full autonomy grants the Palestinian inhabitants real authority over themselves, the land and its resources, subordinate to fair guarantees on the matter of water. I should explain to the Knesset that the last sentence is for us, as it were. We have to receive from someone fair guarantees regarding the water, so that we too have a little water in Samaria, so that water is not completely taken away from us. This is the meaning of the pro-Israeli paragraph. However, as far as the autonomy is concerned, it applies to the Arab inhabitants, to the land and its resources.

I am holding here the book called the Camp David agreement. I am prepared to remain for a whole hour at home and open this book for any of the Knesset members, regardless of his party affiliation. Let any Knesset member read and see whether the agreement contains such words. There are none. They have been introduced now. The difference is very great. We sat in Camp David for 13 days and 13 nights and we, the Israeli delegation, determined, demanded [tav'a] and made it clear: Autonomy is our idea; the word "full" is our word; and this full autonomy is for the inhabitants and not for the territory. We defined this in the clearest possible manner since the difference is so clear. If the autonomy were for the territory, then we would have agreed to the tearing-off of Judaea and Samaria from the Hebrew Eretz Yisra'el, from the State of Israel.

Therefore, we firmly insisted, up till the last day and moment, that autonomy is, as written, to the inhabitants [last three words in English]. It is not written to the land [last three words in English]. There is no mention of these words -- the land and its resources [last five words in English] in the Camp David accords. It was added. This, after all, changes the entire situation, the entire substance and content of the autonomy as we promised it, according to our initiative. There was reason for concern. Again, we should not surrender, we should not fall apart and we should not be deferred. However, what is the cause for joy? What is the reason for the great joy? I could enumerate additional paragraphs but, as an example, the above are sufficient. I am only repeating the question: If all these remarks made by the President of the friendly superpower. [sentence as heard]

As a parenthetical clause I would like to say: What is on the agenda today is not the friendship between Israel and the United States. This friendship between our two nations and our two countries stands; it exists. Today we are having an argument with the U.S. administration, and I am sure we will win this argument. I am convinced that all this foulness will be pushed aside. There have already been documents, including some from the United States, of which all that remains is the memory of them. This plan, in my opinion, was stillborn. It does not exist even today and no doubt in the future nothing but the memory of it will remain. Yet the friendship between Israel and the United States will continue to exist and it will be heart-felt. And we will be friends with a friendly President and we will be friends with a friendly administration.

Today there is a great argument between Europe and the United States regarding the gas pipeline from Siberia and very serious things are occurring, including sanctions. So what? So have France and Great Britain stopped being friends of the United States? Has the United States ended its friendship toward these two Western countries or with the Netherlands and Belgium? Nothing of the kind! There is an argument and, if necessary, it will be a difficult argument and we will continue it. However, it is not the friendship itself between us and the United States that is on the agenda today.

Now I would like to ask a question and answer it immediately. There are five clauses here.

They have no place in the Camp David agreements and were not written there. They do not appear. We should stand against this. A U.S. diplomat told me during the current ongoing argument on this document I received, which is called the American position [last two words in English], and while posing a question: True, we signed the Camp David accords. I told him: You signed as a witness. He answered: True, we signed as a witness, but can we not add to it? I told him: Sir, of ocurse you must not add. By adding you may sometimes distort the entire agreement.

Here is a small parable as to what this resembles: Let us assume I receive a promisory note from somebody who undertakes to pay me, one of these days, 5,000 shekels. He has no more. What do I do? I add a small zero. What have I done? I have not changed a thing. The agreement stands unchanged. Things that were not mentioned at all in the Camp David accords were added; its entire content was changed; its entire substance was distorted and we are then asked to accept the new agreement. We refuse.

Again, what is the source of the joy? I know the answer. A week ago, dear friends and opponents, I read an article in DAVAR, under an eye-catching headline in huge letters that said the following: The Partitioning of Eretz Yisra'el Is the Realization of Zionism. I read this headline and was astonished. The newspaper of the Eretz Yisra'el laborer, DAVAR. But then I understood what all the glee was about. There was no other reason but that the U.S. President appeared and wished to inform me that western Eretz Yisra'el must be partitioned once again. It was united in the 6-day war and now it is necessary to divide it, and also to divide Jerusalem. As to Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District -- not all of this territory but nearly all -- should be handed over to Jordan, to the Jordanian Kingdom. The rest, involving some certain alterations of the border, is yours. This is the substance of all the U.S. positions from A to Z and the rest everyone can figure out for himself. This is the content. This is the main thing. This is the A, B, and C: to repartition Eretz Yira'el. Then they say: But, after all, this is our plan; after all, we are in favor of it. This is how Zionism will be implemented, after all. Therefore, the plan, as it is called -- President Reagan's plan -- is similar to the Alignment plan. Admittedly, not like twins, but there is a resemblance. This is the source of the glee. Can you not see what happened? The Likud will now stand in opposition to a certain U.S. position, whereas we, the members of the Alignment, will be close to the kingdom in Washington. We will walk hand in hand with the great superpower and appear abroad and in Israel precisely with the same message: that it is necessary to divide Eretz Yisra'el and hand over a large part of Judaea and Samaria to the Jordanian monarch.

Now I would like to express my surprise: Sirs, members of the labor movement, where did you get this theory in 1982 -- namely, that Eretz Yisra'el should be divided for the implementation of Zionism, or, as you say, in order to have a Jewish state here rather than a binational state? [indistinct heckling from Alignment MK Ra'anan Na'im]

Let me tell you, MK Na'im, it is pleasant [pun on Na'im which means pleasant in Hebrew] to hear you, but this time you talk nonsense. Let us have long lives and see. See me in 5 years and tell me this. Well, I am asking where you get this idea. I will bring testimonies. [heckling]

Well, I read -- and this, too, is a document, Mr Ya'aqobi -- that the partition was an attempt on our lives. It was this plan together with its internal logic that led to the 6-day war. That war was not only the outcome of An-Nasir's craze; it stemmed from the fact that the country was divided. The hopes of the Arabs who were beaten in 1948 were nurtured and grew because we existed in a divided country for 19 years. The partition did not lead to conciliation with any part of the Arab nation; on the contrary, the artificial borders and the refugee problem enhanced the hatred and fostered the hope to have us annihilated. The Cabinet should declare to the world a policy of settling all the liberated territories. Who was the author of this? Yitzhaq Tabenkin. Are there any disciples of Yitzhaq Tabenkin here?

Are there? The partitioning of Eretz Yisra'el is the realization of Zionism? Is it? [indistinct interjection by MK Tawfiq Tubi]

Tawfiq Tubi, are you a pupil of Tabenkin? What is with you? I would like to tell you what the late Moshe Sharet wrote following a meeting he and the late Hayim Weizmann held with the British high commissioner, (Wokopp), after the first plan to partition Eretz Yisra'el was submitted. On that occasion, Weizmann hinted [indistinct interjection by MK Yosi Sarid] It is not nice to interrupt someone. It is true you have a lot of gall, but you should not interrupt Sharet and Weizmann. All right, fine, so what? And what if you are not an expert in this? Will you let me talk or not? [indistinct interjection by MK Roni Milo, trying to silence MK Sarid, followed by interjections by MK Ehud Olmert, with the acting speaker calling all to order]

Weizmann, as Moshe Sharet wrote, hinted that he himself believed and was sure that even if the partition plan were accepted, we would in the future expand over all the land, and that he thought this was nothing but an arrangement for 25 or 3 years to come. [as heard, presumably meaning 30] And indeed, he nearly prophesied. Thirty years later there was no more partitioning. He was speaking in 1937, and in 1967 there was already the 6-day war and the partition was abolished.

Who taught you the theory that the partitioning of Eretz Yisra'el is in keeping with Zionism? You are denying and turning your backs on your ancestors, parents, your teachers — explicitly so. However, if you wish to deny your teachers, why don't you? [interupted by indistinct interjection by MK Yosi Sarid, who is called to order for the second time; MK Yosef Rom tries to counter him]

Now let me tell you, off the cuff, a story that is very realistic. I would only like to say, seeing that someone may try to interrupt me, that I am prepared to swear that every word I will now say to the Knesset is true. In the days of the Sinai campaign I held a personal, completely secret, meeting with David Ben-Gurion, of blessed memory. He told me the following: I have held a conversation with Guy Mollet, the prime minister of France at the time, and I have told him: It is necessary as a result of the Sinai campaign to alter the Middle East map. Eretz Yisra'el, up to the Jordan River, must belong to the Jewish people, and this will be the basic change after which there will also be peace. Guy Mollet replied, so Ben-Gurion told me: Some thought should be given to this idea. Nothing came out of it, and everyone knows what happened after the Sinai campaign, but David Ben-Gurion — and I am revealing this for the first time — can you hear this, Yig'al? David Ben-Gurion, who in 1948 signed the partition — even though in 1941 or 1942 he declared the Biltmore plan regarding all of western Eretz Yisra'el — he himself in early 1957, at the beginning of that year, informed me that he raised before the prime minister of France the plan to reunite western Eretz Yisra'el. [indistinct interjection by unidentified Knesset member] You, after all, are not a disciple of Ben-Gurion; you were the student of [Moshe] She [an extreme rightist-turned-leftist] which is Stalin. So what do you want?

The question arises: From whom did you learn all this theory? I remember exactly what I related just now. [indistinct interjection by various MK's]

I want to tell you, friends, today I honored Ben-Gurion by mentioning him in the Knesset. He was a friend of mine, a friend in his last years, and all the Knesset members know it. After all, by reporting this fact to the Kensset I honored him! He was a Zionist, a father of Zionism, and I respected him for that. To my mind he also erred, but everyone makes mistakes. Still, he did great and wonderful things. However, in 1957 he wanted to reunite western Eretz Yisra'el and he made a political effort to realize this. So all your shouting will not help. [indistinct interjection by MK Yosi Sarid, who is called to order "for the last time"]

The Cabinet decided unanimously in its extraordinary session, following an in-depth debate, to reject outright the positions as presented to me on 31 August by Ambassador Lewis on behalf of the President. Some people wish to barter, let them do so, but not on behalf of the State of Israel. You, gentlemen, will have to learn that only one body speaks in the name of the State of Israel, and it is called the Cabinet, not you. Today you are not representative of the State of Israel. You represent part of the public, a part which is gradually diminishing. If there is no dispute over this, then draw your conclusions and do not dispatch messengers to whisper in President Reagan's ear that most of Judaea and Samaria should be given to Husayn. The [transcript] of the conversation is right in front of me; I read it with my own eyes. [indistinct interjection by MK Ya'aqov Gil] This interjection by you is demagoguery. You are trying to conduct the affairs of the country in every part of the world, in Europe and in America. You purport to represent it. Well, you are not representing it at all. We are. [indistinct interjection by MK Yosi Sarid, who is called to order for the third time and later asked to leave the assembly hall] Since Mr Shem-Tov so dramatically said: The opposition in the Knesset represents the majority; the Cabinet represents the minority -- well, I have a suggestion to make to you. Go and convince your friends. Let us agree today to hold new elections in May or June 1983. Agreed? Let us all vote on this. We shall then prove to you what will remain of the alignment. You, after all, always base yourselves on public opinion polls. I read one yesterday. Mr. Ya'aqobi, do you believe in polls? Did you read yesterday's poll in THE JERUSALEM POST? You must have seen nothing when you read the results of that poll. Indeed.

Now I would like to address a call across the ocean in regard to conducting the affairs of the State of Israel. Ever since the plan called positions [last word in English], intervention in the most internal affair of the State of Israel has been developing, with officials leaking and reporters writing. This is the beginning of the end of the Begin administration. I would like to tell the editorial staff of THE WASHINGTON POST and that of THE NEW YORK TIMES, as well as Mr Anthony Lewis and Rabbi Herzberg: You will obtain the exact opp[illegible] of what you want by making such statement. This is a democratic people and you will not crown any government or prime minister in it. Rather, this people will elect the prime minister and his government. You are accepting him and inviting him! [As heard, probably replying to various interjections by a number of Knesset members] We are all family. [addressing MK Arye Nehamkin] Is he from Mahalal, not Kefar Vitkin? I was always under the impression that you were from Kefar Vitkin, where my daughter-in-law comes from. So you are from Yirka? Well, you see that we met some place! We have met. May we not meet again under the same circumstances.

Mr Speaker, a call was issued to these benches urging them not create the impression that they are conducting the affairs of the country, because they cannot even conduct their own affairs properly. We will conduct the affairs of state as long as we enjoy the confidence of the people and the Knesset. Let us hope there are early elections and we will prove to you what your real strength is, and particularly together with MAPAM. Beware Shem-tov, before the elections. Some have said that a real blow has been dealt to the Cabinet and that it is said and embarrassed. Nothing of the sort, nonsense! I would like to tell you, friends. You are still not fathoming our thinking. You will, in both senses of the word [pun on the verb root laredet, namely to fathom an idea and also to go down, descend] I tell you, every day and every night, when I remember this campaign with the most stubborn and adamant leaders of the world. Campaign over what? Over Jerusalem, the one and only, whole, the capital of Israel! Over what? Over Judaea and Samaria, the cradle of our culture, over Eretz Yisra'el. Each day I tell myself, blessed am I for having been caught in the act of doing a righteous thing [mitz a]. We have been conducting this campaign with raised spirits, with Jewish pride, with a deep conviction and belief. Our knees are not shaking at all.

Nobody will determine for us the borders of Eretz Yisra'el. Nobody will determine for us what our homeland is. I received the President's message and he said: Even if your answer is not positive, I will stand by these positions with total dedication. [last nine words in English]. I receive this seriously. I am addressing President Reagan from the rostrum of Israel's Knesset and am telling him simply: The Israeli Cabinet has decided vis-a-vis the positions transmitted to me on your behalf: No, we rejected them. We shall stand behind this position with total dedication. [last two words in English]

However, there is a difference. For you, Mr President, this is a political matter. Maybe you should really get closer to Saudi Arabia, maybe you again what to shake the hand of King Husayn after he was at odds with your predecessor, President Carter, for 4 whole years, and even refused to come to Washington. Perhaps you have additional tendencies in the Arab world. This is policy. I respect it. This is a serious matter. For me, Mr President, for us, Mr President, this is our lives, this is our homeland, this is our country, the country of our forefathers and sons. This is the difference. The whole world will see what dedication [last word in English] you will gain. There is no fear. We are America's friends and will continue to be so.

On the matter of Lebanon, we are cooperating and will continue to do so. If anyone wants to take Judaea and Samaria from us we will tell him: Judaea and Samaria are for the Jewish people for generations to come. I shall not keep silent for Zion, nor will I keep quiet for Jerusalem. This is the announcement by the decisive majority of the Jewish people in the homeland and in the diaspora. I only serve as its mouthpiece. Let the scoffers mock, let the jesters continue with their jests. Bialik [a Hebrew poet and writer] said something about these jesters. Nothing will change this situation and we shall win the campaign, with God's help. With God's help we shall win this campaign and will win the day for our people. [heckling from Hadash MK Tawfig Tub]

Mr Speaker, I am honored, as prime minister, to ask the Knesset to approve the Cabinet decision of 2 September 1982.

Likud Motion Adopted

TA081500 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1015 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Motions submitted by the various Knesset factions at the end of the Knesset debate on 8 September -- live]

[Text] [MK Shapira] The concluding motion submitted by the Likud, NRP, Agudat Yisra'el, TAMI and Tehiya:

A. The Knesset confirms the government's announcement as presented by the defense minister on Operation Peace for Galilee -- its reasons, its development and its security conclusions.

B. The Knesset sends its condolences to the families who lost loved ones and wishes a speedy recovery to the wounded.

C. The Knesset expresses its gratitude to the IDF, its commanders and soldiers for the courage, sacrifice and initiative it showed in fighting for peace in the Galilee, for all its settlements and inhabitants.

[Knesset speaker] Thank you. A concluding motion by the Labor Party, MAPAM, Ratz and Shinuy will be submitted by MK Dani Rosolio.

[Rosolio] A concluding motion to the Knesset debate on Operation Peace for Galilee submitted by the Alignment faction, the Labor Party, MAPAM, Ratz and Shinuy:

1. After the end of the fighting in Lebanon the Knesset expresses its deep appreciation for the IDF's ability and sacrifice as they were manifested in this war. The Knesset sends its condolences to the bereaved families and wishes full recovery to all the wounded, and expresses its hope that those captured will soon return home.

2. The Knesset expresses its appreciation for the firm stand by the rural and urban settlements in the north during the shellings and expresses satisfaction over the quiet and peace now prevailing there. The Knesset sees as the top priority the ensuring of peace for these settlements in the future. In the framework of a permanent arrangement, it should be ensured that these settlements will not be under the threat of fire and the threat of the terrorists.

3. The Knesset states that the IDF should not be activated for other than direct security needs of Israel, its settlements and its people.

4. The Knesset expresses satisfaction that the terrorists and the Syrians evacuated Beirut without a military takeover of the western part of the city. The Knesset thinks the heavy bombings were unnecessary for the terrorists to evacuate and they damaged Israel's image as a state with humane principles.

5. Following the removal of the terrorists and the Syrians from west Beirut the IDF's stay in Lebanon should be as short as possible. The IDF will ensure the security strip vital to Israel in southern Lebanon until a permanent arrangement is secured in the area, whether by a multinational force or by the Lebanese security forces.

6. Israel will refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon.

7. Israel will refrain from taking military action against the Syrian forces stationed in Lebanon, while mutually respecting the existing agreements [heskemim] between Israel and Syria.

8. Israel will advance the negotiations for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon through the mediation of the United States, and in a political way only. Thank you.

[Mr Kohen] Thank you MK Rosolio. The concluding motion submitted by the Hadash faction will be brought by MK Tawfiq Tubi. Please, MK Tubi.

[Tubi] Honorable Speaker, honorable Knesset: The motion of the HADASH faction to conclude the debate on the defense minister's summary of the war in Lebanon:

1. The Knesset states that the war begun by the Govern of Israel, with the cooperation and the backing of the United States, which is now entering its 4th month, was not undertaken to insure peace for the Galilee and the security of Israel. The development of the war proves it came to exterminate the national right of the Palestinian Arab people, to finally annex the West Bank and Gaza, to turn Lebanon into an Israeli-American protectorate and to depose the Al-Asad regime in Syria.

2. The Knesset condemns the Begin government for the genocide war, the war to exterminate a people, the war crimes it perpetrated in Lebanon against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. The Knesset also condemns the barbaric siege of Beirut, the bombing of its civilian population and its terrible destruction. Only today the UN sources announced that in Beirut alone more than 6,000 civilians, -- men, women and children -- were killed in this war as a result of the Israeli bombings, and this in addition to the thousands of wounded and scores of houses destroyed in Beirut alone. These crimes have stained the name of Israel and revolted all of humanity.

3. The Government of Israel cost the people of Israel in this war thousands of dead and wounded -- needless sacrifices which did not solve any of the basic and painful Israeli problems.

4. The Knesset states that the war against Lebanon, with all its horrors and sacrifices, advanced Israel neither toward peace nor toward security. Even after the PLO's evacuation from Beirut the PLO was not exterminated and the Palestinian problem was not exterminated, and the just struggle of the Palestinian Arab people for national independence and for establishing a state alongside the State of Israel was not exterminated. The PLO came out with greater prestige and world support, and the State of Israel came out the loser, politically and morally. The Knesset states that there is not and cannot be a military solution to the Palestinian problem, but a just and peaceful solution based on the honoring of the independence of both people, in two states.

5. The Knesset condemns the inhuman behaviour of Israel's forces toward the Palestinian Arab people in the occupied areas of Lebanon; it condemns the mass detentions, the destruction of the refugee camps, their second and third expulsion, and the criminal sabotage of the international efforts to bring humanitarian aid to the Palestinian refugees, when the goal of this policy is to scatter them to the winds, while squashing their rights as human beings.

6. The Knesset calls on the government to stop interfering in the internal affairs of Lebanon, to stop inciting trouble between the sects and to try to establish a puppet regime under the aegis of Israeli occupation army. The threats by Minister Sharon that Israel will continue to maintain its occupation of Lebanon as long as a government which will obey Israeli dictates is not established in Lebanon, should be condemned.

8. [number as heard] The Knesset calls on the government to stop the aggressive war in Lebanon, to stop incensing Syria in an attempt to bring an all-out war to the area. The Knesset calls for the return home without delay of the Israeli soldiers.

[MK Kohen] Thank you, MK Tubi. Knesset members, we are now going to vote. I would like to add that the Telem faction should be added to the Likud motion.

[Voting takes place]

[MK Kohen] Knesset members: For the Alignment motion: 38 votes for and 52 votes against. The motion is rejected.

[Voting takes place on the Likud motion]

[MK Kohen] On the Likud motion: 50 votes for and 40 against. The motion is adopted.

IDF DESTROYS 4 SYRIAN LAUNCHER VEHICLES 9 SEP

TA091052 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1050 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] This morning air force planes attacked and destroyed four launcher vehicles carrying SAM-9's which had been located in the Dahr al-Baydar region, 10 km east of Bhamdun. All planes are safe. This has been reported by the IDF spokesman. The State of Israel, the spokesman said, is firm in its intention and decision to not permit the Syrians to infiltrate surface-to-air missile batteries into Lebanon.

LEADING LABORITE ZADOK ANALYZES REAGAN PLAN

TA080747 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 8 Sep 82 p 10

[Hayim Zadok commentary: "Without Hysteria or Euphoria]

[Text] The government resolution rejecting the new American "positions" is based, first, on the charge that they contradict the Camp David accords and, secondly, on opposition to their substance.

While the substantive merits of the American positions are a legitimate subject for discussion between the United States and Israel and for a public debate inside Israel, the claim that they contradict Camp David is completely unfounded.

The American document has come to be referred to as the "Reagan plan." This is a misnomer. It is not a "plan" in the sense of being a blue-print for a settlement, which the United States has invited the parties concerned to adopt as a pre-condition to resuming talks or as a basis for negotiations. Camp David remains the sole negotiating framework. What President Reagan has submitted to those parties is a set of proposals which the United States is putting forward for the autonomy talks.

It is perfectly entitled to do so. The role of the United States in the negotiations has been consistently described by the other parties as that of a "full partner." In a joint letter from Prime Minister Begin and President As-Sadat to President Carter, signed simultaneously with the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty in March 1979, they both confirmed their understanding that the United States Government will "participate fully" in all stages of the autonomy negotiations.

True, during the protracted autonomy talks, the United States has confined its role to that of a detached referee or, at most, mediator. But three years of talks have produced no tangible results.

The gap between the positions of Egypt and Israel has proved unbridgeable, and the talks have reached a dead end.

In these circumstances, the United States is not only entitled, but indeed bound, to come up with ideas and proposals of its own which, in its opinion, are conducive to getting the talks moving again.

The Cabinet resolution deals with seven specific matters. These merit closer scrutiny.

Jerusalem, as the Cabinet resolution states, "is nowhere mentioned in the Camp David agreement." At the time the accords were signed, there was an exchange of letters, each party stating its own position on Jerusalem. Israel's position was that "Jerusalem is one city, indivisible, the capital of the State of Israel. The Egyptian position was that "Arab Jerusalem is an integral part of the West Bank." The United States reiterated its traditional position that Jerusalem should remain undivided and that its final status should be determined by negotiation.

This exchange of letters amounted to an "agreement to disagree," and Jerusalem remained a matter of controversy. But there is nothing in Camp David to preclude any party from coming up with proposals concerning Jerusalem in the context of the autonomy negotiations.

The specific proposal of the United States now is "participation by the Palestinian inhabitants of east Jerusalem in the elections for the West Bank-Gaza authority." The government has rejected this proposal on the grounds that it would amount to the "re-partition" of Jerusalem into two authorities -- the one of Israel, and the other of the administrative council of the autonomy.

It seems that the Cabinet has read into the American proposal more than it says. The proposal is that the Arab inhabitants of east Jerusalem should have the right to vote in the elections; it is not that the authority of the administrative council should extend to east Jerusalem. There would, consequently, be no re-partition between two authorities.

But even in this narrow sense, the American proposal is not acceptable to the Labour Party. Its position is that the whole of Jerusalem is part of the State of Israel, and all its inhabitants are residents of Israel. Camp David envisages the election of a self-governing authority by the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. The inhabitants of east Jerusalem are not inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

Security. The American proposal is that in the transitional period, there shall be "progressive Palestinian responsibility for internal security based on capability and performance." The Cabinet resolution omits mentioning another American proposal, in the same document, that external security "must remain in Israel's hands during the transitional period."

The resolution asserts that "in the Camp David agreement no distinction is made between internal security and external security." This is simply not so.

Camp David provides for the establishment of a "strong police force." The local police force is expressly required to "maintain continuing liaison on internal security matters with the designated Israeli, Jordanian and Egyptian officers." Thus, the police force of the self-governing authority has been given a role in matters of internal security. Furthermore, under Camp David, the parties are to negotiate an agreement that "will define the powers and responsibilities of the self-governing authority." The extent of the authority of the administrative council in matters of internal security is, therefore, a perfectly legitimate subject for negotiation.

The American proposal on internal security is a good illustration of what Henry Kissinger has been wont to refer to as "constructive ambiguity." The assumption of responsibility for internal security by the self-governing authority is not to be immediate but "progressive" and it is to be based "on capability and performance." Clearly, the proposal is flexible enough to allow the parties sufficient negotiating room for a successful conclusion. Israel's security must be fully safeguarded.

A real settlement freeze. It is true, as the Cabinet resolution points out, that "in the Camp David agreement, no mention whatsoever is made of such a freeze." But there is nothing in Camp David to preclude any party from making proposals in the autonomy talks for a total or partial freeze of settlement activity, or other restriction on, during the transitional period. Israel's position on the substance of the American proposal is, of course, another matter.

It is just as well that the U.S. has abandoned its position that Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza are illegal. The Labour Party and successive Labour governments have never accepted this view.

The establishment of settlements in the West Bank and Gaza is not a matter of law or a matter for international agreement but rather a matter of Israeli policy. The Labour Party would not agree to a total freeze on settlement activity. In its view, Israel's settlement policy should be guided solely by considerations of national security and should be restricted to strategically important areas, which, it so happens, are sparsely populated. The Labour Party is strongly opposed to the establishment of Jewish settlements in areas densely populated by Arabs.

The definition of full autonomy. That [definition] proposed by the United States seeks to give the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza "real authority over themselves, the land and its resources, subject to fair safeguards on water."

On this, the Cabinet resolution comments that "such a definition is nowhere mentioned in the Camp David agreement."

This is true, but it is equally true that Camp David contains no other definition. One thing is clear: Full autonomy must mean more than just autonomy. Any attempt to define what "full autonomy" means would be an exercise in futility. The only possible definition is one in practical terms, through a negotiated and agreed definition of "the powers and responsibilities of the self-governing authority."

The guiding principle must be that during the transitional period the Palestinian inhabitants should be given a large measure of self-government, which will enable them to manage their own affairs, subject only to Israel's security interests and concerns. Obviously, if, as provided by Camp David, Israeli Armed Forces are to be deployed in "specified security locations," the land required for this purpose, for free access to such locations and for the protection of Israeli military installations cannot come under the authority of the administrative council.

The same would apply to public lands required for settlements in strategically important areas. Given the political will to reach an agreement, the working out of mutually satisfactory arrangements concerning land and natural resources, including water should not be beyond the negotiating skill of the parties.

Ties with Jordan. Under Camp David, Jordan has been assigned an important role in the negotiations leading to an agreement on autonomy, in the administration of autonomy and in the negotiations on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza.

Jordanian citizens may be included in the "strong police force" of the self-governing authority; liaison is to be maintained between that police force and Jordan in matters of internal security; and Jordanian forces are to participate in joint Jordanian-Israeli border patrols and control posts "to assure security of the borders."

The American proposal calls for "economic, commercial, social and cultural ties between the West Bank, Gaza and Jordan." On this, the Cabinet resolution merely comments that "in all the clauses of the Camp David agreement there is no reference whatsoever to such ties." We have been left in the dark as to whether, and to what extent, the government favours or opposes such ties.

Of course, such ties already exist -- de facto -- as far as the West Bank is concerned. There is a constant and large-scale movement of persons and goods from the West Bank to Jordan and back. People living in Jordan are allowed to visit the West Bank and vice versa. Students resident in the West Bank are allowed to go to Jordan for their studies. The curriculum in West Bank schools is the Jordanian curriculum.

These de facto ties -- economic, commercial, social, cultural — have always been perceived in Israel and elsewhere as desirable and useful. Are they to cease when autonomy is inaugurated? Is the West Bank to be isolated from Jordan when its inhabitants achieve self-government?

Ties with Jordan may be anathema to the Likud government, whose ultimate objective is the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza. They are welcome to the Labour Party, which has always sought a solution of the Palestinian problem in association with Jordan.

Sovereignty is the crux of the matter.

The Cabinet resolution says that "there is nothing in the Camp David agreement that precludes the application of Israeli sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District following the transitional period." Of course there isn't.

Nor is there anything in Camp David that precludes the establishment of a Palestinian state or any other solution as to the final status of the West Bank and Gaza, including a solution on the lines of the present American proposal. This proposal, as expounded in President Reagan's speech and a statement of the secretary of state, is based on the following elements:

> Security Council Resolution 242 applies to the West Bank and Gaza.
> The United States has accepted the view that Israel's pre-six day war boundaries were vulnerable and there will, therefore, be no return to those boundaries.
> Israel has a right to exist in peace behind secure and defencible borders.
> The final borders will be settled by negotiation.
> The United States favours association of the West Bank and Gaza with Jordan.
> The United States will not support the formation of a Palestinian state.
> There will be security arrangements which will include the complete demilitarization of the West Bank and Gaza.

The new elements in the United States' proposal are the endorsement of Israel's right to defencible borders, other than the pre-June 1967 lines, support for a Jordanian solution of the Palestinian problem, the demilitarization of the West Bank and Gaza and the rejection of the idea of a Palestinian state. These elements are in line with the traditional positions of the Labour Party.

The Labour Party is firmly opposed to the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza. Annexation is not only unrealistic, in that it is rejected by the entire Western world, including the United States, and [it] is totally unacceptable even to the most moderate elements in the Arab world, but even if it were possible, it is also against the basic national interests of Israel.

The incorporation into the body politic of Israel of 1,300,000 Arabs, having strong ethnic, religious and cultural ties with their kinsmen in neighbouring countries, would transform Israel into another Lebanon, another Cyprus, another Northern Ireland, which would carry within itself the seeds of constant unrest, disruption, strife, violence and bloodshed and would put the very existence of Israel as the Jewish state in jeopardy.

It is both politically and historically incorrect to say that the Labour Party has accepted the American proposal on the future of the West Bank and Gaza. Rather, the United States has now endorsed the principal elements of the traditional Labour position. The Labour Party can note, with a measure of satisfaction, that the much maligned and often ridiculed ideas of "territorial compromise" and "Jordanian option" have come to be endorsed by the United States.

Palestinian state. The Cabinet resolution cannot, of course, overlook the fact that the United States has committed itself not to support the establishment of a Palestinian state.

As against this clear commitment, the Cabinet has embarked on a highly imaginative but strictly hypothetical scenario. If parts of the West Bank were handed over to King Husayn, he could invite Yasir 'Arafat to come to Nabulus and assume control. A Palestinian state would thus come into being, which would enter into an alliance with the Soviet Union and arm itself with all modern weaponry. This Palestinian state would then create a common front with Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Syria. After a while, they would, together with other Arab states, launch an onslaught against Israel and attempt to destroy her.

This seems to be a rather alarming possibility, even though it does not sound quite realistic: voluntary surrender of territory by Husayn to 'Arafat? An alliance between 'Arafat and the Soviet Union in a common front with Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Syria? One cannot help wondering whether this is real or a flight of fancy.

We are considering a situation after a peace treaty with Jordan. Such a treaty will provide for security arrangements, including demilitarization of the West Bank and Gaza. If 'Arafat were put in control and began to arm himself "with all modern weaponry," Israel would do exactly what it would do if Egypt were to violate the existing demilitarization arrangements under its peace treaty with Israel: It would immediately send in the IDF to redress the violation.

One could develop an at least equally alarming scenario with a slight modification. Israel annexes the West Bank; Husayn is overthrown by 'Arafat; Jordan under him forms an alliance with the Soviet Union and obtains all modern weaponry; common front with Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, other Arab states; onslaught against Israel. Would Israel's military position under this scenario be any better than under that outlined by the Cabinet? From the point of view of Israel's security, one can hardly discuss a difference between the two. Israel is strong enough to deal with both.

Israel's response to the new American proposals should be neither a hysterical rejection nor a euphoric embracement, but a sober examination of each and every element of the proposals and the adoption of the balanced positions best designed to serve the national interests of Israel and its relations with the United States.

The writer is a former minister of justice and a leading member of the Labor Party.

SAVIDOR DISCUSSES 8 SEP MEETING WITH BUSH

TA081805 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1705 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Knesset Speaker Menahem Savidor told U.S. Vice President George Bush today that Israel may hold early elections to decide on the plan presented by President Reagan. He is convinced that the people will reject the plan. In contrast, the U.S. vice president said U.S. public opinion supports the President and the administration is determined to stick to Reagan's plan. After the meeting, our Washington correspondent Shalom Qital spoke with Menahem Savidor:

[begin recording] [Question] Mr Knesset Speaker, you have now spoken to the U.S. vice president. I assume that the new U.S. plan -- President Reagan's initiative -- was one of the subjects you talked about. What did you say to each other about this matter, over which there is such a sharp controversy between the two countries?

[Answer] Well, this was the main topic of discussion, although we also spoke about other matters. The vice president stands firmly behind the President; this is only natural. We explained that there is a deviation here from the Camp David plan, and we said that in this matter, they are already determining, in fact, what the fate of the territories will be. In my humble opinion, were this matter to be brought before the public in Israel, the vast majority -- and I am not only speaking about the Knesset elections -- the vast majority of the people would reject this. It is very possible, I said, that the matter will lead to early elections so someone will possess an overwhelming mandate to reject this initiative. In contrast, the vice president maintained that here, according to his estimate, a majority in the Congress will stand behind the President's plan and they all want to expedite the peace process, especially after what they saw here about what is happening in Beirut and Lebanon. I claimed that at present the congressmen in both houses still do not have all the data as to what the plan's implications are -- both in terms of Israel as a strategic asset, and in terms of what this plan contains beyond what the President said in his speech.

[Question] Mr Savidor, do you have the impression that because of disparity -- or so you describe it -- and if the disparity remains, that the United States will exert pressure on Israel or that it is preparing additional steps apart from the speech and these words of persuasion?

[Answer] Listen, I do not think that one should panic or fear measures such as the stoppage of aid and the like. I have said to the vice president, and also to those I met yesterday, that if you take into account that Israel receives less than 1 percent of the U.S. defense budget , and what it does for the West and the United States -- including the results of Operation Peace for Galilee, what this has given the United States and the Free World -- I do not think we should have complexes or deal in apologetics or be afraid that someone will take this aid from us. [end recording]

POST POLL SHOWS POPULARITY RISE FOR BEGIN

TA070813 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 7 Sep 82 p 3

[Report by political correspondent Mark Segal]

[Text] Tel Aviv -- Premier Menahem Begin's popularity reached its highest point in nearly two years, while Defence Minister Ari'el Sharon's standing slipped during the war in Lebanon, according to a JERUSALEM POST poll conducted in the third week of August. Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir and Finance Minister Yoram Aridor have also enhanced their positions. The only opposition politician to make any headway was Yitzhaq Rabin, while Shim'on Peres slipped far down the chart.

Question: "Who is best suited to be prime minister?"

	August 82	June 82	May 82
Menahem Begin	54.0	51.5	40.4
Yitzhaq Rabin	14.2	12.7	10.9
Yitzhaq Navon	4.4	5.7	10.1
Shim'on Peres	3.4	4.7	7.5
Ari'el Sharon	1.1	0.9	0.4
'Ezer Weizman	1.5	1.1	2.4
Others	2.6	1.6	2.5
Undecided	18.8	21.8	25.8

The poll was conducted by the Modi'in Ezrahi Research Institute among a representative sample of 1,937 adults. Begin's popularity has increased 14 percent since May. Institute Director Sara Shemer pointed to Rabin's steady rise in the polls and the marked decline in Peres' standing. A demographic analysis indicates that more than ever before, Begin enjoys the loyalty of the Likud's blue-collar constituency, mainly Jews of African or Asian origin.

Question: "Who is best suited to be defence minister?"

	August 82	June 82	May 82
Ari'el Sharon	51.8	56.0	42.1
'Ezer Weizman	6.7	4.6	10.5
Yitzhaq Rabin	5.2	5.3	8.1
Hayim Bar-Lev	3.2	3.0	2.8
Mordekhay Gur	1.8	1.7	2.0
Rafa'el Eytan	1.0	0.9	1.1
Others	3.4	2.7	4.8
Undecided	26.9	25.8	28.6

Shemer noted that although Sharon remained the unchallenged choice for defence minister, his standing has eroded since the war in Lebanon, probably because of the criticism aired against his performance. Sharon's strongest support is among the Sephardi younger voters (18-22), the less educated, and supporters of the Likud and the religious parties.

Question: "Who is best suited to be finance minister?"

	August 82	June 82	May 82
Yoram Aridor	36.0	33.8	34.4
Yiga'el Hurwitz	4.9	6.9	6.4
Hayim Ben-Shahar	2.4	3.6	3.6
Ya'aqov Levinson	2.1	1.0	2.4
Gad Ya'aqobi	1.2	1.7	1.3
Ya'aqov Meridor	1.0	1.5	1.3
Simha Ehrlich	0.5	0.6	1.8
Others	2.9	2.2	4.3
Undecided	49.0	48.1	44.5

Shemer noted Aridor's constant popularity despite the heavy taxes imposed after the war. His predecessor at the Treasury, Yiga'el Hurwitz, still holds second place, with the two nearest Labour rivals, Ben-Shahar and Levinson claiming one-fifteenth of his support.

Question: "Who is best suited to be foreign minister?"

	August 82	June 82	May 82
Yitzhaq Shamir	42.4	41.2	34.5
Abba Eban	13.7	14.4	18.5
Yitzhaq Rabin	2.6	2.6	3.4
Hayim Herzog	1.4	1.1	1.0
'Ezer Weizman	1.7	-	1.9
Shim'on Peres	1.0	0.9	1.5
Moshe Arens	1.9	0.7	1.0
Others	3.0	3.1	4.1
Undecided	32.3	36.0	34.1

ALGERIA

PRESIDENT RECEIVES MESSAGE FROM 'ARAFAT

LD081300 Algiers APS in English 1040 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Algiers, 08/09/82 (APS) -- President Chadli Bendjedid, president of the republic, FLN Party secretary general, received a message from the PLO Executive Committee president, Mr Yasir 'Arafat.

Mr 'Arafat who sent the message before his leaving Tunis for Fes to take part in the Arab summit, stressed that the Palestinian Resistance highly appreciated Algeria's assistance and support for the Palestinian cause.

POLISH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION ARRIVES 7 SEP

LD081310 Algiers APS in English 1042 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Algiers, 08/09/82 (APS) -- A Polish parliamentary delegation led by Mr Stanislaw Gucwa, president of the Polish parliament, arrived here yesterday for a few-day official visit, at the invitation of Mr Rabah Bitat, Politburo member, head of the People's National Assembly (APN).

In a declaration to the press, Mr Gucwa said that his visit would contribute to the reinforcement of friendship relations and cooperation between Algeria and Poland. He praised Algeria's efforts for its development and its part on the international scene mainly in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism. He also hailed its determination in favor of just causes in the world.

In the afternoon, the Polish parliamentary delegation conferred with an APN delegation headed by Mr Rabah Bitat.

LIBYA

AL-QADHDHAFI, HUSAK BEGIN TALKS IN PRAGUE

LD082016 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1837 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Talks between the brother leader of the revolution and Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the republic, began in Prague this evening.

Taking part in these talks were the following brothers: the secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau; the secretary of heavy industries; and the secretary of the General People's Committee for Housing; and on the Czechoslovak side: Lubomir Strougal, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and prime minister; Mr Rohlicek, Central Committee member and deputy prime minister; Bohuslav Chnoupek, Central Committee member and foreign minister; Bohumil Urban, minister of foreign trade; and Vaclav Jumr, Czechoslovak ambassador to the Jamahiriyah.

ANTI-FAHD DEMONSTRATION IN MEDINA REPORTED

LD090900 Tripoli Voice of Arab Homeland in Arabic 0115 GMT 9 Sep 82

[Text] An angry people's demonstration last night swept the Arabian Peninsula, condemning the betraying and capitulationist posture of King Fahd. The demonstration passed through the streets of Medina and thousands of pilgrims took part in it. The radio of the ruling family last night alleged that the demonstration was carried out by Iranian pilgrims, while reports arriving from Medina say thousands of sons of the Arabian Peninsula held this demonstration, turned the picture of King Fahd upside down and called for his downfall.

It appears the situation now is ambiguous, especially after the arrival of reports that the police force of the hysterical ruling authority brutally crushed the demonstrators, which follows in the wake of the dirty role by King Fahd in declaring recognition of the Zionist enemy during his participation in the Fes summit.

AZ-ZAHF AL-AKHDAR URGES ARABS TO CONFRONT ENEMY

LD062058 Tripoli JANA in English 1650 GMT 6 Sep 82

[Text] Tripoli, Dhulqidah 18, September 6, Jamahiriyah News Agency -- AZ-ZAHF AL-AKHDAR newspaper today wrote the following leader: There are crowns and swords on the heads and shoulders of the Arab presidents and kings enough to open not Beirut only but also Iakko. And around the necks of their women there is enough to buy thousands of weapons and necessary equipment. But the shame which is stamped on their foreheads prevents them from confronting the situation resulting in the destruction of Beirut. We see them now hiding behind one another pretending they care much for rebuilding and protecting Beirut, so they rush to attend the conferences of treason.

With the fall of Beirut, fell the Arab authoritarian parties which took hypocrisy as a profession and hid behind the seats to continue their hegemony on the area and Beirut in particular. The fall of Beirut revealed the impotence of the so-called opposition in the Arab countries and it was clear how close is their link with the rulers.

Beirut should bury under its rubble all the Arab decay to start afresh in formulating an honourable Arab history and bring up a new Arab generation immaterial of the cost. A generation which is committed to clear out the darkness into which the Arab world has sunk.

This is not something impossible nor it is difficult to defeat the enemy when all the Arab resources are poured together in a progressive revolutionary movement that rejects the presence of an invading Zionist and racist entity inside the Arab world. And as the houses of the poor were destroyed in Beirut this time, then the palaces of the fake leaders should be pulled down in the future. And because thousands of innocent children who disappeared under the rubble of Beirut, then the medal holders speech lovers and seat worshippers this time should disappear totally from the scene. [sentence as received]

An Arab glory made by the masses should be built with the incitation of the revolutionary committees through their dismantling of all treacherous facades and figures and through a revolutionary popular theory that leads a class struggle employed for the interest of the workers.

The Arab nation feels so disappointed and frustrated as a result of the consecutive pounding exercised against it through the summits of treason and the courts of palaces. The next stage is that of revolutionary action which aims to liberate Arab land and restore Arab dignity. This urges the revolutionary committees to lay down their practical programmes to be carried out with the utmost courage and ferocity and with all available financial and moral resources. Any meaning of lunery [as received] has disappeared under the shadow of the death which covers the Arab arena and sends its instruments of destruction in every election. We have to establish grounds for confrontation, and to achieve that, we have to depend only on the Arab rifle, blood and sacrifice.

JANA: AL-FATIH REVOLUTION MEETS ARAB OBJECTIVES

LD061540 Tripoli JANA in English 1415 GMT 6 Aug 82

[Text] Tripoli, Dhulqidah 18, September 6, Jamahiriyah News Agency -- Fes summit is expected to start today in Morocco as extension to the Fes summit held last November to endorse Fahd and Reagan plans.

It is quite obvious that the kings, heads of state and prime ministers heading to Morocco to participate in this conference have known motives to hold this conference apart from endorsing Fadh's plan and Reagan's initiative.

These motives are despair and inferiority complex which made them refrain from joining in repulsing the Israeli invaders. They have chosen the road of the weak, the submissive and the desperate amidst which U.S. imperialism found its way to achieve two-edged goals: to reinforce positions of Arab reactionary regimes and enable the Israeli invaders to occupy Lebanon and from it to other parts of the Arab world.

The reactionary regimes are well aware of this reality but continue to be in the U.S. orbit wrongly believing this sort of political activity will achieve something. If anything is achieved, it is submission to U.S.-Israeli imperialist plots. The Arab masses are aware of the meaning of Fes summit which convenes after too late, and also aware that there is only the road of struggle to repulse the Israeli invasion and destroy the death train which finds it away to the rest of the Arab world.

The Great al-Fatah Revolution was the best to express and analyze the national objectives of the Arab nation where it had chosen the sound revolutionary method and right stance in carrying out the national tasks which are up to the level of the imperialist, Zionist and reactionary challenge.

This stand as stressed by Colonel al-Qadhdhafi on the 13th anniversary of the Great al-Fatah Revolution is a courageous and sound national stand, quite different from the stand of all those who hid behind humiliation and shame, refrained to take effective action to repulse the Israeli invasion and ran away from the confrontation summit and bowed to the Israeli enemy.

MAURITANIA

CMSU MEETS, SUPPORTS PLO, CITES CONCERN ON CHAD

AB070815 Nouakchott Domestic Service in French 0700 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] The Permanent Committee of the Military Committee for National Salvation [CMSN] held an ordinary meeting in Nouakchott on 6 September under the chairmanship of President Khouna Ould Haydala. During the meeting, the committee examined domestic and world issues.

On the homefront, the committee secretary briefed members on the current mass education campaign. In this regard, the Permanent Committee expressed satisfaction with the smooth pace of the campaign and with the results already achieved. It appealed to the people to cooperate in conformity to the regulations establishing the mass education system and to the instructions of the CMSN chairman issued on 12 April.

On the international front, the Permanent Committee chairman briefed members on the meeting between the leaders of Mali, Algeria and Mauritania held in Algiers on 29-31 August. The committee expressed satisfaction over the outcome of the meeting which undoubtedly will give new impetus to cooperation among our three countries.

Examining the Middle East situation, the CMSN Permanent Committee reiterated its unflinching support to the brotherly people of Palestine under the leadership of the PLO. It expressed the view that any solution for the Palestinian people must take into account the inalienable right of these people to live freely on the land of their ancestors.

On the situation prevailing in Chad, the Permanent Committee expressed concern over the developments in that country. It, however, expressed its belief in the capability of the Chadian people to foil imperialist plots and to put an end to the civil war.

The CMSN Permanent Committee unreservedly condemned the attacks launched by South African troops against Angolan territory and appealed to the international community to ensure that such aggressive actions do not go unpunished.

MOROCCO

LE MATIN WELCOMES REAGAN MIDEAST PROPOSALS

?MO81021 Casablanca LE MATIN in French 3 Sep 82 pp 1, 3

[Ahmed Alaoui editorial: "At Last!"]

[Text] The threatening message sent to Begin by U.S. President Ronald Reagan is a marked change of U.S. policy toward the Zionist state.

Indeed, that unusually tough injunction was handed to the Zionist leaders by the U.S. ambassador in written form. It is, therefore, not a statement but a document, which confers upon it an official and sacrosanct character.

Moreover, President Reagan was anxious to confirm his ideas in a speech delivered last night in Burbank, California.

In that message, the U.S. President strongly prohibited any new Zionist settlement in the occupied territories and that runs counter to the plan to Judaize those territories implemented by Israel and aimed at destroying all their Arab character.

In addition, President Reagan's message opposes any further annexation of the territories occupied since the 1976 war. Indeed, Israel is carrying out its annexationist policy in two stages: Judaization and annexation. Thus, it has annexed Jerusalem and the Golan Heights and, following the invasion of Lebanon, was preparing to annex the West Bank, which Begin refers to only as Judaea and Samaria in order to stress what he claims to be their Jewish character, together with Gaza. That would accomplish the Zionist dream: the appropriation of all Arab Palestine.

The U.S. reaction is, therefore, realistic and positive and contrasts with the policy pursued by the United States since the fateful 1947 partition and the creation of Israel in 1948. At that time, the U.S. vote was decisive, but it was not obtained without difficulty, since President Truman opposed the partition. Nevertheless, since then, the Zionist state has lived and survived solely thanks to the United States, thanks to the financial, economic and -- especially -- military aid provided without reservation and which enabled Israel to possess sophisticated weapons, and thanks also to constant diplomatic support, notably in the Security Council where the U.S. veto has saved Israel from the sanctions its attitude deserved.

Moreover, because he was sure of unconditional U.S. support, Begin showed so much arrogance and disdain. However, he lacked moderation, believing he could overstep the tolerable mark, going so far as to crush Lebanese and Palestinian civilians under bombs and shells.

In that connection, we stress that although Israel could claim a military success which was ultimately very paltry since it was acquired through a veritable massacre of innocent people, the Palestinian people won a resounding political victory and their cause emerged stronger from those events. Indeed, the Palestinians heroic resistance did more for their cause in 3 months than the last 30 years. It won them universal sympathy and international opinion became fully aware of the real facts of the problem.

That awareness particularly was reflected by President Reagan's initial strong reaction after the savage bombing of Beirut while U.S. envoy Philip Habib was trying to find a settlement. The U.S. President became really angry and ordered his protege bluntly to cease fire once and for all and allow the negotiations to succed, and that was done.

Since then, there have been signs of a change of course in U.S. policy since Secretary of State Shultz in a recent statement recognized the existence of the Palestinian problem, whereas Washington was hitherto unwilling to hear talk of anything but Israel!

The secretary of state, questioned several times on the administration's stand on possible Palestinian self-determination, refrained from using that word but stressed that the Palestinians "should play a role in determining the conditions in which they are governed."

"I think," Shultz added, "that the establishment of a situation in which the Palestinian people can have a sense of their dignity and control over their existence is very important and an essential part of any agreement."

Of course, that is still just a reaction, but President Reagan and Mr Shultz are not men who commit themselves lightly, especially in view of the strength of the Zionist lobby in the United States.

That means there has been a real awakening among U.S. leaders and opinion sparked, first, by the courage and heroism of the Palestinian fighters and people and, second, by the fact that Begin and Sharon went too far. Account also must be taken of the fact that the United States is by no means anxous to cut itself off from the Arab world. The Arab ministerial council meeting in Mohammedia, the unanimity demonstrated, the speech delivered by His Majesty Hassan II whose tone and gravity created a strong impression and the forthcoming Fes summit were all factors leading the U.S. leaders to react vigorously to finally settle the problem with respect for the Palestinian people's right.

The United States now has committed itself and a White House commentary clearly stressed that this week:

The warning U.S. President Ronald Reagan has just given Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin on the West Bank's future confirms the United States is now growing accustomed to the idea of a Palestinian state.

Thus, everything has combined to bring the United States to a better understanding of things.

In that connection, King Hassan II's initiative, the appropriateness of which we recently stressed, now seems even more appropriate since it had a great influence on the new U.S. policy line. Once again, we can only highlight the considerable impact of that initiative launched at the most favorable time; once again it is possible to talk of the king's sixth sense....

It is also possible to recall the letter sent by His Majesty King Hassan II to President Reagan, asking him to guarantee Yasir 'Arafat's safety in order to allow him to take part in the Fes summit.

Today, President Reagan's message has considerable political and psychological significance. It is no longer possible to talk of the unconditional nature of U.S. support for Israel and we note that with satisfaction because we have long awaited that reaction which is more in keeping with American morality than unconditional support for an outlaw state. That is an additional reason for not joining the anti-American tirades of some people who cherish a deep-seated, narrow, gratuitous hostility toward the United States. For, in the final analysis, the solution to the Middle East problem, the solution to the Palestinian problem is not to be found in Tel Aviv. It is to be found in Washington.

ETHIOPIA

VOICE OF SOMALI, ABO FRONTS REPORTS ON FIGHTING

'Abyssinian' Losses

EA081426 (Clandestine) Voice of Western Somali and Abo Liberation Fronts in Somali to Western Somalia 0930 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The gallant Somali Abo freedom fighters engaged black Abyssinian colonialist forces at (Arba Mincha) in (Masno) district on 20 August. In the battle, the gallant fighters killed 40 Abyssinians and wounded many other enemy soldiers. Four enemy army vehicles were destroyed and 45 AK rifles were captured. On the Somali Abo freedom fighters' side, 12 were martyred while 13 others were wounded.

In another attack launched against Abyssinian colonialist soldiers stationed at (Bodad) in (Dinle) district of Sidamo region on 22 August, the gallant Somali Abo freedom fighters killed 67 Abyssinian soldiers and wounded many others. The Somali Abo fighters also captured 28 RPG rocket launchers and a large quantity of ammunition. Five Somali Abo martyrs were killed while four others were wounded in that attack.

WSLF Attack

EA061258 (Clandestine) Voice of Western Somali and Abo Liberation Fronts in Somali to Western Somalia 0930 GMT 6 Sep 82

[Text] In an attack launched by the heroic Western Somali Liberation Front [WSLF] freedom fighters against Abyssinian enemy forces in the town of (Butrus), the freedom fighters killed 70 Abyssinian soldiers and wounded many others. The heroic WSLF fighters also captured four rifles and six [word indistinct] from the enemy.

According to a report received on 3 September, the fighting continues.

District Chairman's Surrender

EA061302 (Clandestine) Voice of Western Somali and Abo Liberation Fronts in Somali to Western Somalia 0930 GMT 6 Sep 82

[Text] The chairman of (Hiley) district and a former member of parliament in Abyssinia, (Abd al-Qani Dalmar Hakey), leading 60 armed men, has surrendered to the gallant Western Somali Liberation Front freedom fighters. It is reported that (Abd al-Qani Dalmar) and his force were received warmly.

BRIEFS

SOVIET DELEGATION ENDS VISIT -- The Soviet delegation led by Comrade Viktor Berezi, secretary of the Central Committee of the Education and Scientific Workers Union of the USSR, left for home today at the end of an 8-day working visit. [Text] [Addis Ababa in English to Neighboring Countries 1530 GMT 1 Sep 82 EA]

KENYA

MOI, KAUNDA DISCUSS NEED FOR OAU SUMMIT

EA081658 Nairobi Domestic Service in English 1400 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia left Nairobi this afternoon after holding discussions with President Moi at State House, Nairobi.

President Kaunda arrived in Nairobi this morning en route to several African countries which include Nigeria, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Cameroon. The talks at State House centered on bilateral issues, matters pertaining to the OAU, the Namibian liberation struggle and international economic issues. Reviewing in detail the possibility of holding an extra-ordinary OAU summit before the end of this year, the two presidents agreed on the need to hold such a meeting to save the OAU from total collapse.

President Kaunda however congratulated President Moi for his fair play during his time of office as chairman of OAU. The two presidents agreed that the temporary split in the organization should not be allowed to stop Africa from forming a genuine solidarity in the interests of the continent.

Agreement on Cooperation

EA081432 Nairobi Domestic Servic in English 1000 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Excerpt] Kenya and Zambia today agreed to form a permanent commission for cooperation. The commission will be composed of ministers from the two governments with responsibilities in various areas of cooperation. This was promulgated after a meeting between President Kaunda and his host, President Moi, held at State House, Nairobi, this morning.

According to the agreement signed by the two presidents, the commission shall be responsible for the planning and implementation of a bilateral program of cooperation in order to encourage and promote the development of Kenya and Zambia. It will also carry out studies and investigation with a view to determining the most appropriate form and type of cooperation to be established in various fields. The studies and investigation will include economic development of the two countries, with special emphasis on agricultural, livestock and mining and industrial sectors.

SOMALIA

SOURCES REPORT HALT TO ETHIOPIAN AIR RAIDS

GF081948 Doha QNA in Arabic 1115 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] Doha, 8 Sep (QNA) -- Somali sources said here today that Ethiopian air raids inside Somalia recently stopped after the arrival of U.S. military aid to Mogadishu.

These sources explained to Qatar's AR-RAYAH, in today's issue, that Ethiopian planes are no longer attempting to approach the Somali strongholds after the installation and operation of 10 U.S. radar stations which aid the modern air defense artillery in confronting these planes. It added that tanks, tracked vehicles and military cars as well as anti-aircraft and antirocket guns were included in the U.S. and Italian equipment rushed to Somalia.

On the other hand, the paper reported that the Somali Government is continuing its campaign of obligatory military service for citizens aged 18 to 41 years old, in which the armed forces, police, various political networks and committees formed in Somali cities and villages are participating in the military recruitment of youths, their quick training and dispatch to the battlefront. The paper added that individuals who work in important government positions, licensed businessmen and those who are on vacation in the country from abroad are not included in this campaign.

UGANDA

PLANNING, LABOR MINISTERS ADDRESS UPC SEMINAR

EA042130 Kampala Domestic Service in English 1700 GMT 3 Sep 82

[Text] The government will no longer tolerate double standards where a few misguided individuals seem to be loyal to the government, while at the same time collaborate with its detractors.

This was stated by the minister of planning and economic development, Mr Sam Odaka, when he was addressing a UPC [Uganda People's Congress] workers seminar in Jinja.

Speaking about implementation of government policy, Mr Odaka observed that the stagnation of the country's economy and its eventual decline was due to lack of leadership and economic policies for the last 10 years and he said since the UPC came to power in 1980, its priority has been to stop any further decline in the economy and to provide security for all. The minister stressed that there are now enough incentives to dissuade the people from speculative business and turn to meaningful production.

The minister of labor, Mr Anthony Butele, addressing the seminar on the psychology of workers, called on them to unite under the leadership of President Obote and set about to rehabilitate the country's destroyed industry. He appealed to workers to forget the race for power struggle amongst their leadership so that the country's objectives can be realized. The minister said that the workers should be allowed to participate in some areas of decisionmaking in industry.

On the social security fund, Mr Butele said that the UPC government is anxious to ensure and secure profitable and effective financial management of the social security fund for the benefit of the workers. To this end, he said that the government has decided to give legal personality [as heard] to the fund so that it continues to serve the interests of the workers.

COMMENTARY VIEWS 'RETURN TO RULE OF LAW'

EA061200 Kampala Domestic Service in English 0400 GMT 5 Sep 82

[Unattributed commentary in "Highlights of the Week" program]

[Text] It has always been the aim of the UPC [Uganda People's Congress] government to return Uganda to the rule of law. To this effect, a lot of success has already been registered by the UPC government towards returning Uganda to the rule of law.

When the present government came into power in December 1980, Uganda was in shambles and was haunted by a number of vices, of which the most important were insecurity and economic chaos. President Obote showed his seriousness in the policy of reconciliation and no revenge on 15 December 1980, when he released Godfrey Binaisa unconditionally.

Since the UPC government got into power, thousands of prisoners have been released. In all cases, those released have gone home and none of them have reported any harrassment from anybody. Again, last Friday week, over 1,000 prisoners, most of them former soldiers, were released by the government.

On conditions in the prisons in Uganda, the acting commissioner of prisons recently denied reports that prisoners were starving. The acting commissioner of prisons showed (?stockade) prisoners, who were lining up for their release papers, to pressmen. In a letter by Cardinal Nsubuga to President Obote, about the situation in the Uganda prisons, satisfaction was expressed about the way prisoners were treated in Luzira. In the same letter, the cardinal expressed happiness at the conditions in the prison.

The present government has also succeeded in coming out with an efficient and free judiciary system. Currently, cases of three people who allegedly vowed to topple this government are being heard in court. Although people are aware that remarks and activities made by these kinds of people have caused untold sufferings in Uganda, the UPC government is patiently waiting for the verdict from the court.

Again, it was through the policy of reconciliation and no revenge that, at the beginning of this year, there was an exodus from DP [Democratic Party] to UPC in Busoga. A week ago, Mpigi Northeast MP, Mr (Senkendo), called upon the people of Uganda to bury their political differences and rally behind the UPC government, in order to solve problems facing Uganda. And last week, the same MP was joined by three DP MP's who called upon the people of Uganda to forget their political differences and stop acts of insecurity.

Addressing Mityana subdistrict team and planning committee, the MP for Mubende North, Mr (Bota), and MP for Mubende West, Mr (Sebugwawo), called on the people of Uganda to forget their political differences and other differences.

The remarks of the four DP MP's cannot be ignored especially when such remarks are an immense (?awakening) force among the people of Uganda. It was through this kind of gesture of cooperation that a peaceful end was achieved with the UPC government, which brought the people of Rwenzururu to peace with their brothers and sisters in other parts of Uganda.

Speaking at a press conference recently, the vice president and minister of defense, Mr Paulo Muwanga, called upon Ugandans who engaged in banditry activities to surrender to the government unconditionally. The vice president stressed that if these people surrender no harm whatsoever would be done to them.

Also, during the same press conference, the vice president showed to pressmen five youths that had escaped from a bandits training camp. Mr Muwanga assured the youths that no harm would be done to them but, instead, the UPC government was going to rehabilitate them morally so that they could become good members of society again.

On some mistakes committed by the security forces in Uganda, the president and the army chief of defense forces have come out with clear explanations and policies regarding disciplinary action.

On the economic front, which was one time one of the biggest stumbling blocks, essential commodities like sugar, salt and fuel are now readily available. Because of the freedom extended to the traders which had been denied them in the last decade, the shops are fairly well stocked and, once more to show the seriousness to returning this country to the rule of law, the expropriated properties bill, which sought to legalize the ownership of such property, was passed, allowing owners to return and to reclaim them. Summing up the debate, the minister of justice and the attorney-general, Mr Stephen Ariko, told Parliament that the main aim of the bill was to settle ownership of the property with finality and fairness.

Now, when Amnesty International and the representatives of the UNHCR [UN Office of High Commissioner for Refugees] came out with wild allegations on what is happening in Uganda, the Uganda Government had a just cause to hand to them strong protest statements. While the expropriated properties bill, which sought to normalize one of the violations which was committed to certain races was being debated in Parliament, the two bodies chose to ignore it and came up with remarks that were untrue and damaging to the image of Uganda.

When much has been done to better the Ugandan society, it is absurd for certain persons, in (?pursuit) of personal interests, to continue convincing the world that Uganda was still where it was 3 years ago.

Right now, serious Ugandans have been joined by the people who have come home from Sudan and Zaire and Ruwenzururu people who have called upon their supporters to rally behind the UPC government. All these people toil for the pearl of Africa to rise and shine again.

GHANA

RAWLINGS INAUGURATES ARMY DEFENSE COMMITTEE

AB081934 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The chairman of the Provisional National Defense Council [PNDC], Flight Lieutenant Rawlings, has said that the revolutionary process now going on in the country is nothing more than an attempt for each to establish his own identity and to create a healthy social relationship among the people.

Inaugurating the Army Central Defense Committee [ACDC] in Accra today, Flight Lieutenant Rawlings stressed that Ghanaians are striving to achieve an economic wisdom, which to a large extent depends on restoration of the dignity of man. The PNDC chairman noted that the revolution in Ghana is feared by outsiders because, as he put it, a real evolution is taking place in the country which signifies the collapse of the old structures which have created problems to the people.

The secretary to the Armed Forces Defense Committee, Sgt Alolga Akata-Pore, who is also a member of the PNDC, observed that the enemies of the revolution are devising new tactics to destroy it. It is imperative that the people also develop methods to counteract the activities of the enemies. Sergeant Akata-Pore appealed to Ghanaians, especially those who are leaving the country or intend to leave, to reconsider their decision because everyone will be needed to solve the problems of the country. He advised those who are apathetic to the revolution to wake up.

Sergeant Akata-Pore said what is going on in the country is a democratic revolution which will not compromise with fence sitters. All the people, according to Sergeant Akata-Pore, must come together and fight kalabule [profiteering] which has resurfaced. People must have the ability to insist on paying the stipulated prices for what they buy. He asked the soldiers to ensure the proper maintenance of their equipment.

The chairman of the eight-member defense committee, Sgt Francis Tsakpa, said the ACDC is aware of complaints that discipline in the armed forces is waning. He called for the restoration of discipline which, he said, is an asset for the forces. He pledged that the defense committee will assist in maintaining the army.

The chairman for the function was the army commander, Brig Arnold Quainoo. He said mismanagement and selfishness are some of the factors that contribute to Ghana's problems. He said the revolutionary activities in the country today are signs of regeneration. Brigadier Quainoo said the people's defense committee [PDC] idea will lead to greatness and prosperity. He called on PDC's to avoid venturing into areas which are not their responsibility. They should also avoid arrogance and selfishness; instead, they should be tolerant and sensitive on issues.

PNDC LIFTS BAN ON ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS

AB081930 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The Provisional National Defense Council has announced that the temporary ban placed on the issue of passports has been lifted. An official statement says all applications already made to the passport office would be processed in the normal way. However, the sale of new passport forms and the submission of new applications have been suspended until further notice.

The statement explains that this has become necessary as a result of the reorganization of the passport office and the introduction of new procedures for obtaining passports. The statement notes that emergency cases will be considered.

DELEGATION LEAVES TO ATTEND TRIPOLI CONFERENCE

AB071939 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] A four-man Ghana delegation has flown to Tripoli, Libya, to attend a conference of the African Institute for Study of Human Values. The leader of the delegation, Professor Abdulai Botwey, told newsmen that the conference would discuss the cause of African problems and possible solutions within the context of pan-Africanism. It would also adopt measures to reverse superpower rivalry on the continent and to nurse the diminishing African values and traditions.

Professor Botwey described the failure of the OAU summit in Tripoli as a concrete example of foreign control of Africa's destiny.

More than 125 delegates from Africa, the Carribean, the United States, Europe and Latin America will be attending the conference.

LIBERIA

DOE DETAILS U.S., FRENCH, MOROCCAN VISITS

AB041257 Monrovia Domestic Service in English 2035 GMT 2 Sep 82

[President Doe speech in Morovia on 3 September -- recorded]

[Text] [intercepted in progress] We held extensive and very meaningful discussions with President Ronald Reagan and other high-ranking members of his administration. We met with the chairman and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman and members of the House Finance Affairs Committee and the chairman and members of the Congressional Black Caucus of the United States Congress. We also held very fruitful talks with the mayors of New York, Washington and Los Angeles and we were presented with the keys to these cities. We had the occasion of meeting with leading American business executives. We talked with members of the Liberian community in areas we visited. During our 2-week stay in the United States, we also visited Ohio; Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Fort Belvoir, Virginia and the West Point (?Academy) in New York.

We left the United States on 28 August for Europe and after a technical stop in London, we proceeded to Paris, France, for a 3-day working visit at the invitation of President Francois Mitterrand. We insist on noting that we had very fruitful talks with President Francois Mitterrand and other officials of the French Government as well as other European industrialists and businessmen. There we were warmly received by President Mitterrand and the French Government and people.

We departed Paris on the 31st for the Royal Kingdom of Morocco to begin a 2-day working visit upon the invitation of King Hassan II. In Fes, we held long meetings and discussions with the Moroccan monarchy on world and African issues and bilateral cooperation between our two countries.

My fellow citizens, our (?recent) journey which spans the continental United States, Europe and North Africa was taken at a time when our country continues to be challenged with a variety of socioeconomic problems.

We are initiating positive measures to stimulate economic growth and development, and thereby ensuring better standards of living for all of our people. Thus, as our government and our people continue to take measures in response to our present economic difficulties, we believe it has become necessary to embark upon a sustained effort to mobilize external assistance to complement our own efforts.

It must be stressed that with the concurrence of the People's Redemption Council [PTC] I pledged to personally undertake missions abroad whenever necessary in order to seek assistance from our traditional allies and other friendly countries. Thus, in May of this year I embarked upon a highly purposeful journey to the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria, the [words indistinct] with our visit to the People's Republic of China, which has already committed $44 million to the construction of a modern sports complex in Monrovia, [words indistinct] over $13 million for the rehabilitation of sugar factories in Harper.

Encouraged by the success of our chairmanship, we were pleased to accept the invitation extended by President Ronald Reagan to travel to the United States on 14 August 1982. The objective of our visit to the United States was therefore twofold. Firstly, we sought to give the American people an accurate account of developments in Liberia which are geared toward ensuring stability, national reconciliation, and economic recovery following the revolution of 12 April 1980. Secondly, we tried to win a pledge from the American Government and people for increased assistance to Liberia in all fields of its development. We believe the exchanges and frank discussions we held with the American President, with congressional leaders, the business community and media personnel have helped to give Americans a better understanding of the Liberian revolution.

Mr Cochairman, members of the Cabinet, members of the diplomatic corps, and fellow citizens, in respect of our need for economic assistance, we had a chance to submit to President Reagan for the consideration of his government a proposal for mobilizing $632 million for the construction of the (?Sampaa) hydroelectric project. [applause] We are determined that the opportunity of contributing to our own [words indistinct] economic development and stimulating new investments in those areas that depend on very high energy input. It will further enhance our rural development programs by providing electricty to most of our rural areas by 1985. [applause] The proposal also includes a request for the United States to finance the (?recent) gap of $371 million in the public investment program of our national socioeconomic development plan. [applause] This is necessary in order to maintain the existing infrastructure in the country and to create the basis for future development. Meanwhile, we express deep appreciation for the substantial increase in the United States assistance to Liberia since our popular revolution. [Words indistinct] the IMF and many other friendly governments and institutions are being extremely helpful in keeping our economy afloat since the 12 April revolution. However, as we set out to build a new Liberian society based on freedom, justice and respect for the individual rights of everybody, it becomes imperative that we put the Liberian economy on a firm footing towards sustained growth and development. We therefore urge our traditional friends to go above and beyond their formal commitments and respond to our need for massive assistance that will help relieve us from the various hassles of survival budgets and economic uncertainties.

Mr Cochairman, ladies and gentlemen, I need not reemphasize that the United States and Liberia have enjoyed a long historical relationship that brings America [words indistinct] and for finance in the entire Third World. Therefore, as our nation passes through this critical transition in its national life, we move towards civilian rule in 1985, we believe that the United States has a golden opportunity to make a long-lasting impact on Liberia's economic development.

We believe that the United States can make Liberia sufficinetly strong to remain in the forefront of the global campaign of rescuing the continent from the inability to advance the principle of general peace and stability. [applause] The opportunities must be made [words indistinct]. I am pleased to mention that in addition to our economic assistance proposals, we have requested the U.S. Government for assistance in creating an air capability for the armed forces of Liberia. [applause] As a first step in this direction, the U.S. Government has agreed to provide training for selected members of the Armed Forces of Liberia beginning 1 October 1982 and to provide a number of helicopters and air force planes. [applause] Additionally, the United States has agreed to provide Liberia with $15 million in foreign military sales credits in the fiscal year 1983. [applause] The bulk of this sum will be used for the construction of the much-needed military housing.

During our visit to the United States, we were pleased to extend invitations to President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, Defense Secretary Weinberger, the chairman and members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the House Finance Affairs Committee to visit Liberia. [applause] We are convinced that such visits would give the American leaders firsthand information about the socioeconomic problems of Liberia and the changes these problems (?hold) for U.S. policy in our country.

Upon our arrival in France, we were warmly received at the airport, after which we drove in motorcade to the Hotel George (?V) for the night, during which we were received by President Mitterrand at the Elysee Palace and we then discussed matters of mutual interest to our respective countries and peop'es.

Fellow citizens, we also consider our meeting with President Mitterrand as an excellent opportunity to reaffirm the genuiness of our long-standing friendship, mutual cooperation and respect for each other. President Mitterrand welcomed our invitation to French investors to visit Liberia for the development of privately-owned rubber plantations and investments in poultry and petroleum exploration. [applause] The French president also accepted an invitation from me to visit Liberia in [words indistinct] details of which will be worked out through diplomatic channels. President Mitterrand [applause] promised to consult the French community of industrialists to convey my invitation to them. That same evening we received a number of French businessmen at our hotel, which was a direct result of the president's promise.

In the area of education, President Mitterrand promised more scholarships for Liberians wishing to study in French universities. [applause]

On Wednesday, we arrived in the Kingdom of Morocco from France, and as our aircraft touched down in the ancient city of Fes, we at once observed a display of African hospitality by the befitting honors accorded us. We were equally impressed by the warmness of the Moroccan people during our stay in that historic city, where King Hassan II is temporarily residing. Last night, we were received in audience by the king at the local palace and in an atmosphere of cordiality and with frankness, we discussed important African and world issues.

We reviewed the situation affecting the OAU and arrived at the same understanding that we should do everything possible to save the organization from disintegration. Particular emphasis was placed on strengthening the already cordial ties between Liberia and Morocco in the fields of trade, industry and culture. We agreed that in spite of our difference, our two countries should cooperate in the economic, cultural and technical fields for the benefit of their peoples. In the area of sports, the king has graciously offered us facilities for 22 players and 3 coaches of our national team to travel shortly to Morocco for a 6-month training. [applause] We are appreciative of this gesture and will ensure that the best use is made of the opportunity provided us.

My fellow citizens, ladies and gentlemen, the success of our revolution rests upon freedom, national unity, the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding. At this critical stage of the transition to constitutional rule, it is the obligation of citizens and residents of Liberia to work together toward the achievement of a better Liberia. Accordingly, we call upon all our people to reconcile the great challenge before us and work selflessly to promote unity, ensure liberty and justice and stimulate development. We have said on many occasions that the revolution is in the interest of all Liberians. During our visit abroad, this point was reemphasized. [applause]

And today, we are reaffirming the PRC commitment to Liberia as one nation, in unity and justice for all. [applause] This is a collective challenge which all must help with equal obligation and with becoming (?responsibility). We must therefore courageously face the challenge as one people and become (?charged) with the task of building a new society in which all of us and our children will be able to enjoy the benefits of our labor. Ladies and gentlemen, I say a big thank you. [applause]

PRESIDENT URGES OAU EXTRAORDINARY SESSION

AB062146 Monrovia Domestic Service in English 1900 GMT 6 Sep 82

[Text] The Liberian head of state, CIC [Commander in Chief] Dr Samuel Kanyon Doe, has called on the current chairman of the OAU, Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi, to designate a country where an extraordinary session of the OAU can be urgently held. The head of state said this action should be taken now to avoid any further extension of the political limbo the organization currently finds itself split by. The head of state noted that the future of our organization rests on the ability of the chairman to devise an urgent strategy to save the OAU from collapse. CIC Doe further indicated that the secretary general for OAU, Edem Kodjo, should be outrightly condemned by member states for allowing the admission of the Polisario Front as a member of the organization.

According to a release from the Executive Mansion in Monrovia today, the head of state said he believed the committee set up by President al-Qadhdhafi of Libya to convince other nations to come to Tripoli is not legal and was done simply to save the Libyan leader's face, he said. The composition of the committee is slanted towards the Polisario and does not (?manifest) to playing a neutral role in bringing about a dynamic compromise in the situation, Dr Doe said. He said the unity we have sought to achieve over the last 19 years must not be destroyed by power play or the unscrupulous use of money by some members of the organization to manipulate others towards their own political objectives. The Liberian leader said we should seek to create bonds of unity and understanding in our organization rather than strife and disruption.

MOZAMBIQUE

ARMY OVERRUNS REBEL BASE IN MANICA PROVINCE

MB090715 Maputo in English to Southern Africa 1100 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The Mozambican Army has overrun another major base of the South African-backed (Kizumba) bandits, killing 46 of them. The latest [words indistinct] to be destroyed was situated in the (Machanzi) district of Manica Province in the center of the country. Two terrorists were captured while fleeing from the base and a large quantity of weapons and ammunition supplied by the South African authorities was left behind at the base. Among the captured materiel are 63 mortar shells, 33 cannon shells, 30 bazookas, 15 AK rifles, 8 machineguns and 5 boxes of ammunition. The destruction of the base took place last weekend and was integrated in a series of [words indistinct] by the army.

NAMIBIA

MUDGE: ADMINISTRATOR-GENERAL NO LONGER NEUTRAL

LD072254 Johannesburg International Service in English 2100 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] The chairman of the Ministers' Council of South-West Africa/Namibia, Mr Dirk Mudge, says he no longer regards the administrator-general of the territory, Mr Danie Hough, as a neutral official. Mr Mudge was reacting at a news conference in Windhoek to news reports (?initiated) by Mr Hough last week about discussions which had taken place with political leaders in South-West Africa/Namibia to bring about a more acceptable interim government in the territory. Mr Mudge said the Ministers' Council was not happy about the actions by the administrator-general and, depending on what happens over the next few days, he might be asked to resign.

SOUTH AFRICA

SPOKESMAN DENIES REPORT ON ZAIRE TO ANGOLA DRIVE

LD081658 Johannesburg International Service in English 0630 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Excerpt] The South African Defense Force spokesman has described as nonsense a report by the Angolan ANGOP news agency that regular South African troops were to take part in a drive from Zaire into Angola. A brief statement by the spokesman in Pretoria said Angola was once again resorting to old propaganda to cover its inability to control dissent in Angola. This latest round of nonsense was not worth any further comment.

DEFENSE FORCE 'REGRETS' ZIMBABWEAN STATEMENT

CA081730 Johannesburg Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 8 Sep 82

[Text] The South African Defense Force says it regrets the Zimbabwean Government's statement that the bodies of three South African soldiers who were killed in Zimbabwe last month have been disposed of and has disputed the claim that no effort had been made to claim the bodies.

The Chief of the Defense Force General Constand Viljoen personally challenged the claim that no effort had been made to obtain the bodies. He says the only reply South Africa ever had from Mr Mugabe's government was the blunt refusal to deliver the bodies to South Africa and the soldiers' next of kin.

A later Defense Force statement issued in Pretoria said that it was regrettable that the Defense Force had had to learn this distressing news through the media, especially in the light of its repeated acknowledgements that the men were South African Defense Force personnel. Furthermore, the Defense Force had repeatedly offered to cooperate fully with Zimbabwe in investigating the incident thoroughly, but those offers and requests for cooperation had been thoroughly ignored.

The statement said that if it was true that the bodies had been disposed of as reported, then one wondered about the swiftness of the action and whether possibly there might have been more to it than meets the eye. The three soldiers killed in Zimbabwe [were] former members of the Rhodesian Army.

ZAMBIA

KAUNDA REPORTEDLY SUSPENDS POWER MINISTER

CA081724 Lusaka Domestic Service in English 1115 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] President Kaunda has suspended Power, Transport and Communications Minister Rajah Kunda in an alleged connection with the (Kanyama) disaster fund. According to the Zambia DAILY MAIL, quoting unconfirmed reports, a provincial political secretary, a permanent secretary and a district executive secretary have also been suspended in connection with the same case. The paper said Mr Kunda confirmed that he received a letter from Dr Kaunda suspending him from his ministerial post in connection with the (Kanyama) disaster fund. Mr Kunda said in a brief statement to the press on his suspension that if he had had his own way he would have liked to be completely removed from the post of minister so that the investigating team could have a free hand in probing the matter which has been going on for nearly 4 years now. He said he was thankful to President Kaunda for allowing him to serve in the Cabinet since 1973, during which he said he enjoyed his support and pledged to be loyal to him; and the Director of Public Prosecutions Joshua Simuziya said he was not aware of Mr Kunda's suspension.

ZIMBABWE

OFFICIAL CITES ARMY REDUCTION, DEFECTIONS

CA081730 Harare Domestic Service in English 1600 GMT 7 Sep 82

[Text] The government is planning to reduce the size of the Zimbabwe National Army [ZNA] to only 41,000 members. This has been disclosed by the minister of state in the prime minister's office responsible for defense, Comrade Sekeramayi, in an interview with the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation in Harare this afternoon. Comrade Sekeramayi said the exercise is continuing, and so far the size of the army has been reduced from 65,000 members to 49,000.

The minister has attributed defections from the army to three reasons, which are that some members cannot cope with the discipline in the army, while some stay loyal to a party that is not ruling the country and thirdly others no longer like to serve as soldiers.

On the court-martialing of dissidents, Comrade Sekeramayi said those already under arrest will not appear under a court-martial but those who will be arrested now will. He said if an accused would like to hire a lawyer for the court-martial he is free to do so, but at his own expense. The minister has also announced that the commander of the army, Lt Gen Rex Nhongo, accompanied by senior members of the army will be visiting all brigades of the army to assess what problems they are facing, especially regarding mistrust amongst themselves.